



FALSE FLAGS



Template for Terror




An Analytical Critique of
the Covert Model Utilized
by the Conspirators
Who Orchestrated 9-11,
the Oklahoma City Bombing,
the JFK Assassination,
Sandy Hook and Boston

The “how”
and “why”
as never
explained
before . . .

BY MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

Michael Collins Piper's controversial writings have been translated into multiple languages and distributed all over the world. FALSE FLAGS may well be his most extraordinary work yet—a final judgment on the reality of modern terrorism . . .



ISBN 978-1-937787-90-5
90000
9 781937 787905



FALSE FLAGS

The Russians have a phrase, “the scream of the woodcock.” The phrase is derisory because the woodcock is nature’s ventriloquist, and if you fire your shotgun at the place where the sound comes from, you’ll go hungry. Shoot the woodcock, not the scream, the Russians say.

So let’s see if we can’t find a woodcock—just one—in all these screaming thickets.

—Stephen King’s *Danse Macabre*

False Flags: Template for Terror © 2013 by Michael Collins Piper

First U.S. Printing: October 2013

Available from: *American Free Press*
645 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE, Suite 100
Washington, D.C. 20003
1-888-699-6397
www.americanfreepress.net

Order extra copies of this book from *American Free Press* at \$30 per copy

To contact the author:

Michael Collins Piper
PO Box 15728
Washington, DC 20003
Email: michaelcollinspiper@yahoo.com
Tel: (202) 544-5977
See the website at michaelcollinspiper.com
Hear his broadcast at michaelcollinspiper.podbean.com
and at theuglytruth.wordpress.com

None of the many books I have written could have been possible without the generous support and cooperation of Willis and Elisabeth Carto and the various enterprises with which they (and I) have been associated during the last thirty-three years, dating from the time I first walked in the door at Liberty Lobby in Washington and inquired about the possibility of getting a part-time job at that populist institution.

Little did I know that it would set me on a quite remarkable journey of very real learning that has brought me into contact with a wide-ranging array of people both here in the United States and around the globe. So, quite naturally, I extend my thanks to Willis and Elisabeth for all of their good works that have consequently advanced my own.

There are also many people who have spent endless hours pursuing research into the areas of the JFK assassination, the Oklahoma City bombing and 9-11—and so many other controversies—who have contributed much to my own knowledge and understanding of these matters. To begin thanking them all, individually, would take a book in and of itself.

Yet another special couple must be mentioned: Mark Glenn and his wife, Vickie, who—when they are not busy attending to a large family and a host of farm animals—have been a bedrock of friendship and active in helping me (and so many others) pursue the truths that must be pursued.

And to K & M & H, whose friendship and hospitality—I've written most of my books beside their pool in the company of their wonderful and ever-growing assembly of cats and dogs at their beautiful home in the desert—has been central to my very being for the greater part of my existence.

And one more couple: Ralph and Karen Forbes. Although Karen died all too young—after having raised a large family rivaling even that of Mark and Vickie Glenn—Ralph remains very much in the forefront of the cause of truth.

FALSE FLAGS

Template for Terror:

**An Analytical Critique of
the Covert Model Utilized
by Israel's Mossad
in Orchestrating 9-11,
the Oklahoma City Bombing
and the Assassination
of John F. Kennedy**

**(And the later manipulation
of public opinion in the crises
at Sandy Hook and Boston)**

By MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

SEWARD SQUARE
Washington, D.C.



HUGO CHAVEZ

JULY 28, 1954 - MARCH 5, 2013

DEDICATION

To Hugo Chavez

Although the controlled media painted the Latin American strongman as “anti-American,” the truth is that Hugo Chavez was actually a forthright nationalist critic of the internationalist and imperialist forces of the New World Order. From the time Chavez was elected president of Venezuela, the interlocking network of Rothschild dynasty-linked plutocratic families who dominate the Federal Reserve System and the American military-industrial-media complex—some call it “The Caiaphas Complex”—began conspiring against him.

Chavez knew the source of his opposition. In 2000, announcing a trip to Iraq, Chavez scoffed: “Imagine what the Pharisees will say when they see me with Saddam.” On another occasion he said: “The world has wealth for all, but some minorities—the descendants of the same people that crucified Christ—have taken over all the wealth of the world.”

Should there be any doubt Chavez was perceived as a roadblock in the way of the New World Order, consider the warning issued by David Rothkopf. In his book, *Superclass: The Global Power Elite and the World They Are Making*, Rothkopf spoke approvingly of what he called the new global “superclass”—that is, the New World Order elite—and said that the “political fault line” for the 21st century is the battle of “Globalists vs. Nationalists,” that an emerging “global network of antiglobalists” stood opposed to the “superclass.” He wrote:

At the core of the “anti-network” is a small group of leaders, linked by many shared characteristics and attitudes though they come from widely different regions of the world. They might be characterized as “nationalists,” or opponents of the United States, or critics of Western-led globalization. . . .

Whether you characterize it as nationalist vs. internationalist, populist vs. globalist, or anti-neo-imperialist vs. pro-American globalization, the fact is [the] battle lines are drawn.

Rothkopf named Chavez—along with Russia’s Vladimir Putin and Iran’s Mahmoud Ahmadinejad—as being among that “small group of leaders” challenging the New World Order, confirming that the primary underlying conflict today is—as it has always been—the fight by nationalists worldwide to preserve their nations’ sovereignty in the face of the drive by cosmopolitan internationalists to erect a global imperium.

Although Chavez is gone, other outspoken leaders—with the support of good Americans and good peoples all over the planet—still carry on his fight against the New World Order.

—MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

Israel's Mossad: "Ruthless and cunning . . . a wildcard . . . [that has the] capability to target U.S. forces and make it look like a Palestinian/Arab act."

—THE U.S.ARMY'S SCHOOL
OF ADVANCED MILITARY STUDIES

On September 10, 2001—one day before the tragic terrorist attacks that shocked America—*The Washington Times* revealed in a front-page story that top U.S. Army analysts believed that Israel's intelligence agency, the Mossad, was "ruthless and cunning, "a wildcard" that "has [the] capability to target U.S. forces and make it look like a Palestinian/Arab act."

That explosive and highly revealing assertion appeared in a 68-page paper prepared by sixty officers at the United States Army's School of Advanced Military Studies (SAMS), a Fort Leavenworth-based training ground for up-and-coming Army officers. The Army paper called Israel's armed forces a "500 pound gorilla" that is "known to disregard international law to accomplish [its] mission."

The negative comments about Israel appeared in a SAMS paper putting forth a plan for enforcing an Israeli-Palestinian peace accord requiring an international peace-keeping force of some 20,000 troops stationed in Israel and in a newly-created Palestinian state. That the SAMS proposal factored in the existence of a Palestinian state is an affront by the American Army officers to Israel, which has never fully accepted the idea of a Palestinian state.

In light of the suggestion by U.S. Army officers that Israel might attempt to disrupt U.S. and international peacekeeping efforts in the Middle East and disguise the crimes as those of Palestinian or Arab forces, the events of September 11, 2001—one day after *The Washington Times* reported this story—take on a new light.

Americans have been taught—particularly in the wake of 9-11—to respect our military and to "support the troops." But despite these very clear warnings regarding Israel coming from some of our most distinguished military minds, many Americans continue to trust and support Israel. The reason for this is because the controlled media in America largely suppresses the point of view of those considerable numbers of top military figures who have such concerns.

And it is this same controlled media that has purveyed the "false flags" that have been used to cover up some of the worst terrorist actions—by Israel—of our times.

FALSE FLAGS

False flag (or black flag) describes covert military or paramilitary operations designed to deceive in such a way that the operations appear as though they are being carried out by other entities, groups or nations than those who actually planned and executed them.

Operations carried during peace-time by civilian organizations, as well as covert government agencies, may by extension be called false flag operations if they seek to hide the real organisation behind an operation.

The name "false flag" has its origins in naval warfare where the use of a flag other than the belligerent's true battle flag as a ruse de guerre, before engaging an enemy, has long been acceptable.

Such operations are also acceptable in certain circumstances in land warfare, to deceive enemies in similar ways providing that the deception is not perfidious and all such deceptions are discarded before opening fire upon the enemy.

—From Wikipedia
at [wikipedia.org/wiki/False_flag](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/False_flag)

This false flag scenario about JFK's assassination "remains one of the most intriguing" . . .

Just as *False Flags* was being readied for publication, the first ever collection of the late President John F. Kennedy's correspondence (scheduled for release in November 2013) dared to suggest the theory that Israel's Mossad played a part in JFK's assassination "remains one of the most intriguing" of the many scenarios relating to that crime and cited Michael Collins Piper's *Final Judgment* as the source of that allegation.

Not surprisingly, right after pro-Israel propagandists obtained access to pre-publication copies of *The Letters of John F. Kennedy*, edited by respected historian and television producer Martin W. Sandler, an Internet cannonade savaging Sandler and Piper erupted.

After noting the multiple theories surrounding JFK's death, Sandler's assembly of JFK's letters concludes with nine pages of contentious correspondence between JFK and Israeli leaders David Ben-Gurion and Levi Eshkol, pointing out JFK was convinced Israel's pursuit of a nuclear arsenal was, in Sandler's words, "a serious threat to world peace." As if highlighting these little-known letters were not enough, Sandler inflamed Israel's partisans by his candid introduction to that selection of letters writing:

In March 1992, Rep. Paul Findley of Illinois, wrote in *The Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, "It is interesting . . . [to note] that in all the words written and uttered about the Kennedy assassination, Israel's intelligence agency, the Mossad, has never been mentioned." Two years later in his book *Final Judgment*, author Michael Collins Piper actually accused Israel of the crime. Of all the conspiracy theories, it remains one of the most intriguing.

Sandler wrote of the "bitter dispute" between JFK and Israel that had been "kept out of the eye of both the press and the public" and asserted that one of JFK's letters constituted, in Sandler's words, a "threat" that, he then reiterated, "according to one conspiracy theory, led to Israel's role in Kennedy's assassination."

Sandler cannot be dismissed as a "fringe" writer. A former professor of history at Smith College and at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Sandler is author of some 80 non-fiction books on a wide variety of topics, a number of which were published by the Library of Congress as part of its "Young People's American History Series." A five-time winner of television's Emmy award, Sandler was co-creator and executive producer of a variety of acclaimed documentaries.

Whether the JFK-Israeli correspondence or Sandler's references to *Final Judgment* survive the pressure campaign and actually appear in the book when it actually goes to press remains to be seen.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface:

What this book is about.....13

Foreword:

Yes, American Leaders Pondered Staging

False Flag Attacks on American Citizens..... 19

Introduction:

What We “Know” About Terrorism

and Why (and How) We Know About It.....23

Chapter One:

A Bad Habit

Israel’s Use of “False Flags” in Global Terrorism.....27

Chapter Two:

How Could Anyone Come Up With the Theory

of Mossad Involvement in the JFK Assassination?.....35

Chapter Three:

JFK’s Secret War With Israel Over Nuclear Weapons.....44

Chapter Four:

The Myth of Dallas:

The “Ring Wing” False Flag in the JFK Conspiracy.....57

Chapter Five:

The Man in the Middle:

E. Howard Hunt and the JFK Assassination.....64

Chapter Six:

The “Dummy” Assassination:

E. Howard Hunt and the Events in Dallas.....79

Chapter Seven:

The Trumped-Up Story of E. Howard Hunt’s

So-Called “Deathbed Confession”95

Chapter Eight:

The Mossad’s “Explanation” of

“What Really Happened” in Dallas..... 110

Chapter Nine:

False Flag Number One: The Manipulation of Lee Harvey Oswald From New Orleans to Dallas.....	114
--	-----

Chapter Ten:

“Our New Backers Are the Jews— As Soon as They Take Care of JFK”	124
---	-----

Chapter Eleven:

Yes, the Mossad Was Behind the Oklahoma City Bombing.....	129
---	-----

Chapter Twelve:

Andreas Strassmeir: The Mossad’s Man in Place in the Oklahoma Bombing.....	137
---	-----

Chapter Thirteen:

Timothy McVeigh and the Anti-Defamation League: Long-Time Mossad Monitoring of the “Patsy”	145
---	-----

Chapter Fourteen:

“The Arabs Did It”: Zionist Propaganda and Oklahoma City.....	150
--	-----

Chapter Fifteen:

A Familiar Template for Terror and A Scenario That Does Make Sense.....	155
--	-----

Chapter Sixteen:

September 11, 2001: “The Big Winner Today is Israel”	163
--	-----

Chapter Seventeen:

Blame Everybody but Israel.....	170
---------------------------------	-----

Chapter Eighteen:

The Mossad Link(s) to the First WTC Attack (in 1993).....	179
---	-----

Chapter Nineteen:

The Dancing Israelis Who Celebrated on 9-11.....	186
--	-----

Chapter Twenty:

The Israelis Who Were (or Were Not) There.....	199
--	-----

Chapter Twenty-One: Israel's Capacity to Monitor Bin Laden and Al-Qaeda.....	202
Chapter Twenty-Two: A "September Surprise" for George W. Bush?.....	209
Chapter Twenty-Three: Were Those Hijackers Really Arabs or Were They Really Israeli "Mista'Arvim"?.....	218
Chapter Twenty-Four: Israel's Covert Manipulation of Muslim Extremists: Toward Understanding Israel's Role in 9-11.....	230
Chapter Twenty-Five: Israel's Agents Inside Al-Qaeda: A Critical Element of the Template for Terror on 9-11.....	238
Chapter Twenty-Six: Onward Christian Soldiers What Really Happened on 9-11.....	250
Chapter Twenty-Seven Two Simple Words.....	269
Chapter Twenty-Eight 9-11 and the New Internet Paradigm.....	272
Chapter Twenty-Nine The Crisis Management Conspiracy: The High-Level Experiment in False Flag Crowd Psychology Utilized at Sandy Hook and Boston.....	279
Chapter Thirty Who "The Crisis Actors" Really Are: How Truth Seekers Were Manipulated Into Ignoring Genuine False Flag Terrorism.....	306
Conclusion: It's Time to Take "The Stand"	320

“I think that’s pretty much what happened . . .”

That’s what legendary Washington insider—international arms dealer and public relations man I. Irving Davidson, a longtime registered lobbyist for Israel—told Michael Collins Piper in 1994 about the thesis of *Final Judgment* after he read the book by Piper, with whom Davidson had been acquainted for more than ten years, having been a reader of *The Spotlight*, the newspaper for which Piper was a correspondent.



Davidson’s assessment was significant: For years iconic JFK assassination writer Peter Dale Scott repeatedly suggested Davidson was essentially the “man in the middle” of all of the key power groups that wanted JFK out of the White House. Naturally, Scott was astounded to learn in 2008—when Piper called a radio program on which Scott was a guest—that Piper knew Davidson quite well and that Davidson had endorsed the thesis of *Final Judgment*.

Another JFK writer, John Davis, called Davidson “a schemer and promoter with a vast international network of powerful acquaintances. Comfortable with almost everybody, from sultans and sheiks to Central American tyrants and U.S. Mafia bosses, he was a man who somehow knew secrets nobody else in Washington knew.”

In fact, an overview of Davidson’s colorful career demonstrates why his appraisal of *Final Judgment* is so instructive. Aside from his long-standing intimate relationship with the Israeli war machine Davidson—who imported the first Israeli Uzi machine guns onto American soil—was also a valued confidant of longtime JFK foes such as Teamsters leader Jimmy Hoffa and New Orleans Mafia boss Carlos Marcello and was the Washington representative for Latin American strongmen as Nicaragua’s Somoza, Cuba’s Batista, Trujillo of the Dominican Republic and Haiti’s infamous “Papa Doc.”

For years, Davidson (a friend of Richard Nixon) lived on the same block in Washington as FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover and Sen. Lyndon Johnson, whom he also counted as friends. The Capitol Hill lobbyist for Hoover crony—Dallas power-broker Clint Murchison—Davidson was a business partner of LBJ’s protege and “bagman,” Bobby Baker and also frequently engaged on behalf of the CIA and the National Security Council. And that’s just the tip of the iceberg.

Today, Piper says: “If anyone knew ‘what happened’ it *was* Irv. When—right there in his office in the Commerce Building—Irv said quietly, ‘Your book, *Final Judgment*, I’ve read it,’ and then told me what he thought (nodding his head, staring me straight in the eye), I nodded back, recalling the old saying, ‘Ask me no questions and I’ll tell you no lies.’ He volunteered nothing further and I asked no questions. But I did have a satisfaction in hearing him say what he did.”

PREFACE:

What this book is about . . . A Familiar Template for Terror

One of the more perceptive students of the JFK assassination, Vincent Salandria, wrote of the proliferation of theories surrounding that crime and noted an important point that, even today, remains (unfortunately) all too relevant when we consider all that has been written about the president's murder. And please consider Salandria's words carefully:

While the [JFK assassination] researchers have involved themselves in consuming preoccupation with the microanalytic searching for facts of *how* the assassination was accomplished, there has been almost no systematic thinking on *why* President Kennedy was killed.

Another respected JFK researcher, Richard Sprague, put forth a parallel thesis when he asserted:

As incredible as it may seem . . . the identities of the actual Dealey Plaza team, including shooters, radio communications men, coordinators, and others, do not really matter in the overall conspiracy and especially in the cover-ups. The murder was a carefully orchestrated intelligence operation

Lee Harvey Oswald did not fire any shots that day. Once one moves beyond the stage of thinking that Oswald did the shooting, the questions about who was shooting become secondary to the questions about who *planned* and *commanded* the execution and *why* they did so. [Sprague's emphasis.]

So it was that these quite accurate—even profound—considerations addressed by Salandria and Sprague were foremost in my own mind when I began (quite unexpectedly) writing *Final Judgment*, my rather controversial book which contends that Israeli intelligence played a central role in the JFK assassination conspiracy.

As such, I deliberately refused to bog myself down in addressing those aspects of the assassination that had already been covered so considerably by so many different writers over what was then some thirty years: such issues as *where* the shots were fired from; how many *times* President Kennedy was hit; the *number* of assassins involved, etc.

My concern was precise: Pinpointing who was ultimately *responsible* for the assassination of President Kennedy.

In the end, to my satisfaction and to the satisfaction (I think) of many of my readers, I believe I answered that question, or certainly attempted to do so. I pinpointed the role of Israel's intelligence service, the Mossad, working in collaboration with elements in the CIA and in the organized crime syndicate, specifically those forces under the direct influence of Jewish crime boss Meyer Lansky.

The purpose in removing JFK from office had multiple motivations, needles to say, including, but not limited to: putting an end to the president's war against organized crime; preventing his efforts to curtail the influence of the CIA; and, most notably, in my estimation, stopping JFK's determined efforts to prevent Israel from building an arsenal of nuclear weapons of mass destruction.

Now let it be said up front that what Vincent Salandria said about the JFK assassination is equally applicable to two other equally cataclysmic events in American history of more recent date: namely, the Oklahoma City bombing and the tragedy of 9-11.

In those instances, as in the JFK assassination, many researchers have spent a great deal of time attempting to analyze the forensics of those crimes, often to the point of actually disregarding who ultimately benefited from those horrible events that resulted in the loss of so many lives and both of which had substantial impact upon American public policy. And, in the case, of 9-11, actually led to American involvement in two wars that were needless and should not have been fought.

At any rate, it is my contention, based upon my study of the JFK assassination, the Oklahoma City bombing, and the events of 9-11 that all three of these events has specifically one thing in common:

All were the product of *a particular template for terror* in which the ultimate architect of those crimes utilized false flags to cover up its responsibility. And it is my contention that Israel was indeed the architect of those crimes.

In the first instance, the JFK assassination, attention was initially directed toward a "lone nut" assassin with possible connections to the Soviet Union and/or Fidel Castro's communist regime in Cuba.

In the case of the Oklahoma City bombing, although there was ultimately another variation of the "lone nut" officially rendered as the government's version of events, this time the official patsy—Timothy McVeigh—had an officially-charged co-conspirator, namely Terry Nichols. But broad-ranging evidence, indicating that McVeigh was actively collaborating with yet others in the bombing plot, was officially suppressed. And later in these pages we will see precisely why.

While the Israelis were responsible for the manipulation of Timothy McVeigh and elements surrounding him, the initial aim was to place the

blame for the crime on Saddam Hussein of Iraq and/or even Osama bin Laden, a propaganda theme that gained even greater circulation (and even some credibility, thanks to its propagation by pro-Israel circles) following the 9-11 attacks.

I contend, however, that President Bill Clinton refused to go along with the Zionist agenda and directed those responsible for the investigation—namely the Justice Department and the FBI—to cover up the false flags, those false trails laid by the Israelis linking McVeigh to Iraqis who would, in turn, be connected to Saddam and Muslim elements that the Israelis sought to inflame American opinion against.

I view the Oklahoma City bombing as having been designed to achieve by its architects what was ultimately achieved with 9-11; that is, having the bombing in Oklahoma City to be blamed on “Arab” and “Muslim” elements in order to inflame the American people against the Arab and Muslim worlds, which is precisely what was achieved as a consequence over the furor following 9-11 which, in itself, was perhaps a grander, more dramatic version of what happened in Oklahoma City.

The Israelis certainly hoped the Oklahoma City bombing would have drawn the United States into a war against Saddam who, at the time, was Israel’s most advanced and powerful enemy in the Arab world.

However, I contend, with 9-11 the Israelis essentially returned to the scene of the crime, so to speak—American soil—and once again utilized precisely the same template for terror that had been used in the Kennedy assassination and in the Oklahoma City bombing.

In the wake of 9-11, however, a willing American president, George W. Bush—ideologically motivated in favor of war and surrounded by a sordid array of hard-line pro-Israel advisors—did indeed launch what turned out to be a disastrous war against Iraq and, more immediately, the U.S. incursion into Afghanistan. And the United States remains embroiled in both nations—or what is left of them—today.

There is also another important aspect to consider. And in the pages of this volume, where we examine this template for terror. And that is this: in each of these cases, the Israeli operations against American targets and interests were specifically carried out inside a particular framework that existed in all three scenarios; And that is this:

The Israeli operations were conducted by the process of attaching themselves to already existing American intelligence operations that involved those individuals who were ultimately connected, in the end, to the three crimes.

In the case of the JFK assassination, based upon a variety of evidence coming from a variety of sources, all of which point in the same direction, it appears that the assassination of the president took place

wrapped around a scenario in which there were individuals connected to American intelligence, in particular the CIA and its anti-Castro operations in Cuba, who were involved in setting up what might be called a “dummy assassination attempt” against the president which would then be linked to Castro and utilized therefrom as a means to provide a reason for the United States to invade Cuba and bring Castro to his knees.

Although there are those who insist that JFK was softening the hard-line American stance toward Castro, it appears that there is some valid evidence that’s been brought forth suggesting that President Kennedy was involved in a two-track policy toward Castro; that is, on the one hand, while he was making efforts to amend relations with the Cuban leader, he was, at the same time, pursuing already-existing CIA plans to assassinate the Cuban dictator.

And it appears that it was within that framework, specifically the plots by the CIA against Castro that the Israelis essentially intervened and took over anti-Castro elements being “worked” by the CIA and orchestrated the assassination of President Kennedy himself.

It is a strong likelihood that if President Kennedy himself did not know of the dummy assassination attempt that was being set up in Dallas, that it was quite possible that the president’s brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, was aware of this operation (even perhaps directing it) and, as a consequence, found himself (after the fact) having been cognizant of the very covert framework that was ultimately used by the Israelis to set up the actual assassination of the president.

Keeping that template, that framework, that scenario in mind, move forward then to the Oklahoma City bombing.

In the wake of the bombing, it became apparent that the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms and the FBI—at least those two intelligence agencies, and probably others, including, but not limited to, the CIA—were engaged in monitoring and manipulation of Timothy McVeigh and his associates, including an array of domestic “right wing” elements: so-called militia and “patriot” types, intersecting with persons involved in the “white nationalist” and “white separatist” movements.

A variety of researchers came to the conclusion that the Oklahoma bombing was a consequence of what some have called “a sting gone bad.” That is, that one or more of the American intelligence agencies were manipulating McVeigh to the point of allowing him to build a bomb and place it in Oklahoma City.

The intended purpose of such a sting was for the agency (or agencies) to capture McVeigh just in time and win great headlines exposing the ugly “right wing” terrorist underground, resulting in public plaudits for those agencies at a time when their reputations were at stake.

Now there are other independent researchers who will vehemently argue against that theme and say, "Oh, no, it wasn't a sting gone wrong. It was a *deliberate* bombing orchestrated by elements in the government to usher in a police state." However, no such police state came into being. The United States became no more of a police state under Bill Clinton's presidency any more than it had become a police state under the presidency of Richard Nixon who had been responsible for setting in place a wide variety of executive orders which, in fact, had already established a secret, but still existing, framework that *could* be used to institute a police state during a time of "national emergency."

In the Oklahoma bombing, there is a variety of evidence to indicate that Tim McVeigh did participate in a plot to explode a device outside the Murrah Building. And there are many serious folks who believe (with good reason) that there were bombs inside the Murrah Building.

In the end, the actual *process* itself was not so important as the ultimate *success*: a bomb (or bombs) did go off in Oklahoma City and people died, just as JFK died in Dallas.

In the pages that follow we will examine more of the parameters, but suffice it to say that I believe (and will assert in this volume) that in the Oklahoma bombing (and later in 9-11) the Israelis once again utilized the same false flag template they had used successfully in the JFK assassination. In particular, the Israelis manipulated (or over-rode) ongoing United States intelligence operations and redirected them in a way they not been designed (by the Americans) to conclude:

In the case of the JFK assassination, a dummy attack on the president designed to be linked to Castro (thereby prompting a U.S. invasion of Cuba in retribution) was, instead, turned into "the real thing."

In Oklahoma City, what might have been designed as only a "bomb plot" that federal agents were expecting to foil to great public acclaim, actually resulted in a very real bombing that killed hundreds. And all of this may have even been a surprise to Timothy McVeigh himself.

Then, afterward, as we will see, there were definitive efforts by the Israelis to point the direction of blame toward "the Arabs" and "the Muslims" and even "link" McVeigh to those elements.

However, I contend—as noted—the Clinton administration rejected those schemes and engaged in damage control, so to speak, and strictly limited the Oklahoma conspiracy to Timothy McVeigh.

And as we will see, the Clinton administration studiously avoided pursuing areas of investigation that, if inspected too carefully, would point toward individuals with ties to the Israelis and to agencies such as the Anti-Defamation League and the Southern Poverty Law Center which have been known to operate in advancing the Zionist agenda.

So we find some striking similarities between the JFK assassination and the Oklahoma City bombing.

And before we further reference 9-11 itself in this same context, it should be noted that—although it has almost been forgotten—there was, of course, the first attack on the World Trade Center in 1993. And that attack has been linked to an individual with known Israeli connections. This, of course, will be explored later in these pages.

And keeping that in consideration, we proceed to the third and final leg of the triad—and those are, of course, the events of September 11, 2001. We know the U.S. government’s official contention is that the attacks of 9-11 were the work of Muslim fundamentalists loyal to Osama bin Laden, the now-infamous ultimate “false flag” and one certainly designed to raise the ire (putting it lightly) of the American people against the Arab and Muslim worlds.

However, it must be borne in mind—and this is very important in the context of which we are considering this template for terror—that the 9-11 attacks are known to have taken place at a time when the United States government intelligence and national defense apparatus was on alert; that at the time of the attacks, as has been documented by a variety of “mainstream” sources, the U.S. defense establishment was gearing up for the possibility of “Muslim terrorists” seizing control of passenger liners and using them for terrorist attacks.

Therefore, again, we find an ongoing U.S. intelligence operation that was taken over, compromised, manipulated by outside forces for another purpose: in this instance, the attacks that did take place on 9-11.

Now, in the case of 9-11, we have heard speculation that, for example, there were bombs already inside the World Trade Center or that other means, other than the actual airliner attacks, brought down the trade towers, or that the Pentagon was actually hit by a missile rather than by the airliner the government claims was used in the attack, etc.

Ultimately, these are questions that we may never know the answers to. But do know the *final* result of 9-11:

Events did take place that resulted in the catastrophic loss of life on American soil, a direct consequence of which was that the the Israelis did achieve precisely what they wanted: the complete redirection of the American public attitude toward the Arab and Muslim worlds and major American intervention in Afghanistan and Iraq.

In each case, then, I believe that we find that the same template for terror was used—in the JFK assassination, in Oklahoma City, and on 9-11—and in the pages of this book we will examine the relevant material that demonstrates that this template (first used in the JFK assassination) was repeated later.

FOREWORD:

Yes, American Leaders Pondered Staging “False Flag” Attacks on American Citizens to be Blamed on Foreign Enemies

In the wake of the tragic Oklahoma City bombing, media pundits raised voices of horror at the suggestion by some that U.S. government operatives might have played a part in orchestrating the bombing for some geopolitical purpose or other purposes unknown.

However, in 2001—six years after the Oklahoma tragedy and just six months before the 9-11 terrorist attacks—best-selling author James Bamford released his book *Body of Secrets*, a thoroughly-mainstream history of the National Security Agency.

A respected veteran journalist with close ties to the American national security establishment, Bamford could not, by any stretch of the imagination, be ranked as a “conspiracy theorist.” However, in the pages of his book, Bamford revealed that in January 1961, top U.S. policy makers were considering a horrific scheme to launch terrorist attacks on American citizens and point the finger of blame at Fidel Castro’s communist Cuba.

Here’s what Bamford wrote:

According to documents obtained for *Body of Secrets*, [then-Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman, Army General Lyman] Lemnitzer and the Joint Chiefs proposed secretly to stage an attack on the American naval base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba—and then blame the violent action on Castro.

Convinced that Cuba had launched an unprovoked attack on the United States, the unwitting American public would then support the Joint Chief’s bloody Caribbean war.

After all, who would believe Castro’s denials over the word of the Pentagon’s top military commanders?

The nation’s most senior military leadership was proposed to launch a war, which would no doubt kill many American servicemen, based solely on a fabric of lies.

On January 19, just hours before [then-President Dwight] Eisenhower left office, Lemnitzer gave his approval to the proposal. As events progressed, the plan would become only the tip of a very large and secret iceberg.

Lemnitzer—a self-described “imaginative planner”—kept his initial plan in cold storage. However, after the new Kennedy administration’s Bay of Pigs fiasco, which left Fidel Castro stronger than ever before, Lemnitzer reinvigorated his scheme under the name “Operation Northwoods.”

In *Body of Secrets*, Bamford laid out the shocking parameters of this high-level plan for false flag attacks. Bamford wrote:

The plan, which had the written approval of the chairman and every member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, called for innocent people to be shot on American streets; for boats carrying refugees fleeing Cuba to be sunk on the high seas; for a wave of violent terrorism to be launched in Washington, D.C., Miami and elsewhere.

People would be framed for bombings they did not commit; planes would be hijacked. Using phony evidence, all of it would be blamed on Castro, thus giving Lemnitzer and his cabal the excuse, as well as the public and international backing, they needed to launch their war.

What makes this so additionally disturbing is that this was not some wild scheme by “mad bombers” inside the military. In Bamford’s estimation, “the idea may actually have originated with President Dwight Eisenhower in the last days of his administration.”

Bamford reported that Eisenhower was determined to invade Cuba and that if Castro did not provide an excuse prior to the inauguration of newly-elected President John F. Kennedy, Eisenhower suggested that the United States “could think of manufacturing something that would be generally acceptable.

What Eisenhower was suggesting, writes Bamford, was “a bombing, an attack, an act of sabotage carried out secretly against the United States by the United States. Its purpose would be to justify the launching of a war. It was a dangerous suggestion by a desperate president.” Lemnitzer—Eisenhower’s protege—was eager to carry out the plan.

Although a direct proposal for the assassination of then-astronaut (and future U.S. Senator) John Glenn was never put in writing, Lemnitzer did propose that “if” Glenn’s historic earth-orbiting journey of 1962 should be interrupted by an explosion of his rocket, the U.S. government should:

Provide irrevocable proof that . . . the fault lies with the Communists et al Cuba . . . by manufacturing various pieces of evidence which would prove electronic interference on the part of the Cuba . . .

Lemnitzer also had in mind the possibility of a dramatic scenario recalling the 1898 disaster which befell the *U.S.S. Maine* in Havana harbor, sparking the Spanish-American war:

We could blow up a U.S. ship in Guantanamo Bay and blame Cuba. Casualty lists in U.S. newspapers would cause a helpful wave of national indignation.

Terrorism on American soil by Americans against Americans—but blamed on Castro—was also offered up by Lemnitzer and his advisors:

We could develop a Communist Cuban terror campaign in the Miami area, in other Florida cities and even in Washington. The terror campaign could be pointed at Cuban refugees seeking haven in the United States

We could sink a boatload of Cubans en route to Florida (real or simulated) We could foster attempts on lives of Cuban refugees in the United States even to the extent of wounding in instances to be widely publicized.

Among the extraordinary proposals cited by Bamford, quoting the original documents:

- Exploding a few plastic bombs in carefully chosen spots, the arrest of Cuban agents and the release of prepared documents substantiating Cuban involvement also would be helpful in projecting the idea of an irresponsible government.
- Hijacking attempts against civil air and surface craft could appear to continue as harassing measures condoned by the Government of Cuba.

Following in Lemnitzer's tradition, like-minded "intellectuals" in the defense establishment continued to formulate plans passed on to the military leadership that were designed to provoke a war through a staged terrorist attack. One proposal, cited by Bamford, read:

A contrived "Cuban" attack on an OAS [Organization of American States] member could be set up and the attacked state could be urged to "take measures of self-defense and request assistance from the U.S. and OAS; the U.S. could almost certainly obtain the necessary two-third support among OAS members for collective action against Cuba."

This same proposal made the suggestion that the United States should bribe someone in the Castro regime to launch an attack on an American military installation. This, Bamford pointed out, constituted treason.

Bamford also revealed that one of the defense department's civilian "intellectuals," Paul H. Nitze—then an assistant secretary of defense—came up with a plan sent to the White House in May 1963. Nitze proposed—in Nitze's own chilling words:

A possible scenario whereby an attack on a United States reconnaissance aircraft could be exploited toward the end of effecting the removal of the Castro regime.

In the event Cuba attacked a U-2, Nitze proposed sending in additional American pilots, this time on dangerous, unnecessary low-level reconnaissance missions with the expectation that they would also be shot down, thus provoking a war.

Nitze said that "[T]he U.S. could undertake various measures designed to stimulate the Cubans to provoke a new incident." However, Bamford added wryly that "Nitze, however, did not volunteer to be one of the pilots."

In later years, Nitze—along with his ally Lemnitzer—would emerge as one of the Israeli lobby's key contacts inside the defense establishment in official Washington. Nitze and Lemnitzer—who were both hard-line Zionist Jews—worked relentlessly through a variety of venues to advance Israel's cause, manipulating American policy to benefit their favorite foreign nation.

The obvious point thus naturally arises:

If American leaders would actually consider staging false flag attacks on their fellow countrymen, how far beyond the pale is it to consider the possibility—really, the likelihood—that a foreign nation (in this case, Israel) would stage false flag attacks on American soil in order to advance its own geopolitical agenda?

That's an uncomfortable question for many to face, particularly those people—Christians and Jews alike—who are devoted to the security of Israel and who believe it is the responsibility of the United States and all mankind to assure the survival of the nation that is the home to "God's Chosen People."

However, as we shall see in the pages that follow, there is strong evidence indeed to suggest that America's closest ally did indeed play the pivotal behind-the-scenes role in the three most infamous acts of political terrorism ever carried out on American shores.

In each case Israel did indeed utilize false flags as part of an even more-fine-tuned template for terror that we find repeated again and again and again, beginning with the JFK assassination and then with the Oklahoma City bombing and ultimately with the 9-11 tragedy.

But for the present, let us examine precisely what Americans do "know" about terrorism and why (and how) we know about it . . .

INTRODUCTION . . .

What We “Know” About Terrorism and Why (and How) We Know It . . .

Prior to the 9-11 terrorist attacks, most Americans had little, if any, real knowledge or understanding of the concept of “terrorism.” To the extent that Americans did know anything about terrorism, it largely arose from their recollection of media reports in the 1970s relating to the hijackings of airliners by Palestinian freedom fighters. But, for the most part, terrorism was essentially considered a “foreign” phenomenon and not one that particularly affected Americans, except to the extent that some Americans had been unlikely enough to be aboard a number of the airliners that had been hijacked.

And although the first attack on the World Trade Center in 1993, followed thereafter by the Oklahoma City bombing in 1995, did focus new attention on terrorism—which was now making its presence felt right on American soil—Americans still essentially felt secure at home.

But 9-11 changed all that. Practically overnight, Americans from all walks of life became “instant experts” on the topic. Americans were now thorough-going authorities on “the dangers of Islam” and of the need to “stand by Israel.” Many Americans were absolutely convinced it was America’s God-given duty to wage war on the entire Islamic world.

However, despite the new-found American “popular” understanding of terrorism, the historical record demonstrates that the topic of terrorism was very much a focus of concern on the part of the Israeli lobby in America and that, at the highest levels of our national security establishment, pro-Israel forces were working relentlessly to shape policies (relating to terrorism) that were designed to advance Israel’s agenda in the Middle East and around the globe.

In 1989, Pantheon Books published a little-noticed volume that provides a stark and revealing look at the development and growth of what the authors dubbed “the terrorism industry.”

It is this terrorism industry that has been responsible—almost single-handedly and certainly in conjunction with the major media in America—in shaping what Americans “know” about terrorism (even if what we “know” is not precisely the truth).

In *The “Terrorism” Industry: The Experts and Institutes That Shape Our View of Terror*; Professor Edward Herman of the University of Pennsylvania and his co-author, Gerry O’Sullivan, provided a comprehensive and scholarly overview of the way that powerful private special interests (both foreign and domestic) have worked with government agencies in the United States and internationally to influence the way that the world looks upon the phenomenon of modern-day terrorism.

Although the authors did not focus exclusively on the role of Israel and its American lobby in the “terrorism industry,” it is very clear from their documented findings that Israel does indeed constitute a major player and has, from the very beginning.

According to the authors: “Many of the institutes and think tanks that are important components of the terrorism industry originated or grew rapidly as part of a major corporate offensive in the 1970’s.”

They point out that one of the key organizers and fund-raisers—a powerful public relations voice—behind this corporate offensive—was Irving Kristol who “succeeded in mobilizing a wide array of wealthy individuals, firms and foundations in the overall funding enterprise.”

Kristol, who once headed a front group secretly financed by the CIA, was a longtime leader of the influential New York chapter of the American Jewish Committee and the father of William Kristol, the much-touted “Republican strategist” who—as editor of billionaire Rupert Murdoch’s *Weekly Standard*—emerged (alongside his father) as one of the most influential of the pro-Israel neo-conservatives who were the primary architects of the American wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, all part and parcel, they said, of the over-reaching new “war on terrorism” that emerged after 9-11.

It was the senior Kristol who was thus one of the prime movers behind a growing number of institutions devoting their resources to the study of “terrorism”—at least as Kristol and his associates defined it.

In *The ‘Terrorism’ Industry*, Herman and O’Sullivan have pointed out the Israeli connections of some of the more notable institutions known for their active engagement in analyzing and explaining terrorism:

- The conservative Heritage Foundation “helps fund and engages in joint activities with institutes in Great Britain and Israel.”
- The Jewish Institute on National Security Affairs “was organized and is run by individuals closely tied to the Israeli lobby and can be regarded as a virtual agency of the Israeli government.”
- Georgetown University’s Center for Strategic and International Studies includes such well known “experts” on terrorism often quoted in the media as Michael Ledeen, Walter Laquer and Edward Luttwak who “have had very close relationships with Israel and Mossad.”
- The Institute for Studies in International Terrorism at the State University of New York, has “extensive international ties to military police and intelligence operations as well as the U.S., European, and Israeli right [which] reflect [founder Yonah] Alexander’s own connections.”
- The International Security Council (ISC) founded by the late Joseph Churba, long tied to Israel and the Mossad. ISC was preceded by the Center for International Security which featured, among its board members, Frank Gervasi “a well-known and passionate apologist for Israeli policy.” Churba’s

activities were funded by the Unification Church of Korean cult leader Sun Myung Moon, himself a front for the Korean CIA which has long functioned as an adjunct of the American CIA. The authors note: “There are significant connections between the mainstream terrorism experts and Moon-supported institutes and those affiliated with the Israeli lobby.”

- The American Security Council, a “conservative” group, included James Jesus Angleton, former counterintelligence chief of the CIA, on its board. Angleton, known for his devotion to Israel, was the Mossad liaison for the CIA and was implicated in massive domestic spying on American citizens by the CIA. Although the media has been careful not to disclose the fact, Angleton’s domestic spying operations were largely carried out in collaboration with the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith, the American public relations and intelligence arm of Israel’s Mossad.

With these institutions and others feeding “facts” about terrorism to the public, the media falls down on the job, according to Herman and O’Sullivan, by accepting without question the information (or is it “disinformation”?) on terrorism that the terrorism industry puts forth:

The terrorism industry produces the Western ‘line’ on terrorism, and selects the appropriately supportive ‘facts,’ and the mass media disseminate these to the public.

The transmission process is smooth, as the mass media pass long the manufactured messages without further substantial processing, functioning essentially as conduits.

The U.S. mass media have raised no questions about the premises and agenda of the terrorism industry and generally fail even to filter out or correct literal error.

Herman and O’Sullivan cite, as one example, a four-part series on “counterterrorism” that appeared in *The New York Times* on December 2, 3, 4, and 5, 1984. The authors point out that the *Times* relied on Israeli officials and experts for about 20% of the information disclosed. The balance of those interviewed were largely U.S. officials and other “experts,” but the authors did not indicate whether the U.S. officials and experts included in the *Times* report had ties to Israel and its American lobby.

The authors indicate, based upon their findings, that there is good reason to believe that certain acts of “terrorism” are, in fact, artificially created to advance the agenda of those ostensibly fighting terrorism. They write:

Agents of the state, and those of private groups as well, may not only implicate terrorists from within terrorist organizations, they may urge them to commit terrorist acts to justify

prosecution. They themselves may carry out terrorist acts—attributed to others—for propagandist purposes. We believe that these actions are of great and underestimated importance.

It is not difficult for agents of intelligence organizations to set off a bomb or even to kill individuals, or to encourage or hire others to do these things; then to make a phone call claiming responsibility on behalf of a Red network or Palestinian organization. This is an easy way of creating a desired moral environment, and there is substantial evidence that states have frequently engaged in such practices.

The Israeli government carried out a number of terrorist bombings of U.S. facilities in Cairo in 1955-56, hoping that these would be attributed to Egyptians and damage relations between Egypt and the United States.

In the United States, the FBI has long engaged in *agent provocateur* actions, urging violence on penetrated dissident organizations and carrying out direct acts of violence, then attributed to the individuals and organizations under attack.

In our next chapter we will learn more about the so-called Lavon Affair—the aforementioned Israeli attacks on U.S. facilities in Cairo, a little-known story that says much about Israel's historic record of utilizing “false flags” in its drive for regional (and global) supremacy.

So, there is much more to the business of “terrorism” than meets the eye, as Herman and O'Sullivan have pointed out. For this reason, Americans need to be wary of media reports about “terrorism” and to carefully consider precisely who is behind such reports.

In truth, much of what we think we know about terrorism has been generated in the think tanks, intelligence agencies, public relations groups and other forces that have been part and parcel of the international Jewish propaganda network that lends its skill to advancing the state of Israel.

And as we've noted, it is the mass media in the West—all of which is largely controlled by a tightly-knit clique of Jewish families and financial interests—that has helped propagate the legends (and “false flags”) that have been integral to promoting Israel's agenda.

With this in mind, let us then move forward and take a closer look at the remarkable historical panorama—reaching worldwide—that demonstrates, beyond any question, that Israel (in particular) has an insidious record of utilizing false flags for its own insidious purposes.

CHAPTER ONE:

A Bad Habit: Israel's Use of "False Flags" in Global Terrorism— Pointing the Finger of Guilt Elsewhere

Researchers in the JFK assassination controversy have repeatedly pointed out the false leads that continue to appear. That has been central to much of the discussion surrounding the president's assassination by those critics who have risen up to dispute the infamous Warren Commission Report which concluded that Lee Harvey Oswald—the alleged assassin—was a “lone nut.”

Most who doubt the Warren Commission believe that Oswald was indeed what he claimed to be—the patsy—and that false clues had been laid by the real conspirators to make it appear as though Oswald was an agent of Fidel Castro or the Soviets or both.

One major JFK assassination researcher, Professor Peter Dale Scott, once described what he called “the brilliance of the assassination plot.” This was, according to Scott, “that the conspirators had forged trails to induce a cover-up.” Scott cites a number of instances:

There were, for example, trails that potentially linked Oswald to Fidel Castro or to the KGB and Khrushchev—a trail that might lead to war. Moreover, there was false evidence given to the Secret Service that led to a group of anti-Castro Cubans in Chicago whose operations had been authorized indirectly by Bobby Kennedy himself. This is just one of several trails that might have led in directions that no one wanted to investigate.

(Later in these pages we will come back to that group of “anti-Castro Cubans in Chicago” referred to by Professor Scott.)

However, in my book *Final Judgment*, I asserted that Oswald, Castro, the Soviets—as well as other forces presumed to have been the driving force behind the assassination—were actually “false flags,” utilized by Israel's Mossad as a pivotal (and never-before-considered) behind the scenes mover in orchestrating the president's murder.

Final Judgment contended that Israel and its primary collaborators—traitors within the CIA—utilized insidious “false flags” in orchestrating the assassination and the subsequent cover-up: “the Mafia,” “anti-Castro Cubans,” “the Soviets,” “Castro agents” and even “right-wing extremists” have all been fingered as those responsible for the JFK assassination. But the real hard evidence pointed in another direction entirely and that was in the direction of Israel.

In fact, as *Final Judgment* pointed out, the use of "false flags" by Israel's Mossad to cover up its role in worldwide assassination conspiracies and other criminal activity had been utilized time and again: "Arabs," "the Mafia," "right-wing extremists," and others have repeatedly taken the fall for crimes committed by the Mossad or carried out under its coordination. The use of "false flag" operations by Israel and its Mossad had been documented repeatedly since the Jewish State first came into being.

That Israel has had a long and proven record in planting "false flags" is the subject of discussion in this chapter.

In the opening pages of *Final Judgment*, I noted how former Congressman Paul Findley had cited two cases in which Israel indicated a willingness to sacrifice American lives for its own interests: (a) the attack on the *U.S.S. Liberty* in June of 1967 and (b) the intended attack on an American reconnaissance plane that was overflying Israel's secret nuclear bomb development site. These incidents are particularly intriguing in light of what we will ponder in this volume.

The attack on the *Liberty*—it is generally acknowledged by everyone but Israel and its defenders—was a deliberate attempt to destroy the *Liberty* and its crew and to sink the vessel to the bottom of the Mediterranean. What is most interesting, however, is the reason behind this bizarre and brutal attack—and it was a classic "false flag" attack.

Israel, in fact, hoped to pin the responsibility on a "false flag"—Egypt—and draw the United States into the impending 1967 war on the side of Israel. It is only because the *Liberty* did not sink and instead was rescued that the history books don't tell us today that "the Arabs" sunk an American spy ship and sparked another "*Lusitania* incident" that forced America to go to war.

The second instance to which Findley referred is of special interest inasmuch as the intended attack on an American air force reconnaissance plane was designed to protect Israel's secret development of nuclear weaponry.

It was Israel's nuclear offensive that led President John F. Kennedy into the "secret war" with Israel that he conducted with increasing intensity during the three years of his short-lived presidency.

It was the very issue of Kennedy's intransigent opposition to Israel's nuclear arms development that became a central part of his standoff with Israel and its Mossad. It was this conflict that played a critical part in setting in final motion the conspiracy that ended John Kennedy's life.

That having been said, what follows is an overview of some other notable instances in which Israel utilized "false flags" in its international criminal endeavors.

Perhaps the best-known instance in which Israel used a "false flag" to cover its own trail was in the infamous Lavon Affair—referenced briefly in the previous chapter—in which, in July of 1954, there was a series of bombings in Cairo and Alexandria, Egypt. Among the targets were the libraries of the U.S. Information Service in both cities. In fact, the bombings were an operation by Israeli Military Intelligence who hoped both Egyptian President Nasser and the outside world would believe the attacks were carried out by militant Egyptian Muslim fundamentalists angry at Nasser's friendly relations with the U.S. and Britain.

Israel's ultimate purpose was to destabilize Nasser's relationships with both the U.S. and Britain and compel the British to withdrawal from their bases on the Suez Canal (although, in fact, in the end, no British targets were bombed, the initial plan notwithstanding).

According to Col. Benjamin Gibli, Israel's chief of military intelligence and the senior army officer responsible for sending the final signal to Cairo to initiate the bombings, he had been given his orders by Defense Minister Pinchas Lavon whose instructions were as follows:

[Our goal is] to break the West's confidence in the existing [Egyptian] regime . . . The actions should cause arrests, demonstrations, and expressions of revenge.

The Israeli origin should be totally covered while attention should be shifted to any other possible factor. The purpose is to prevent economic and military aid from the West to Egypt.

The operatives placing the bombs were Egyptian Jews working for Israeli intelligence. However, Egyptian security uncovered the plot and eleven people were taken into custody. In the end, Two were executed. The others were sentenced to long prison terms.

Ultimately Israel's involvement in the affair became public and Israel was rocked in the wake of the scandal. Competing political elements in Israel used the scandal as a bludgeon against their opponents. But the truth about Israel's use of a "false flag" had come to international attention and demonstrated how Israel was willing to needlessly endanger innocent lives as part of its strategy to expand its global influence.

To the degree that it is recognized for what it was—a "false flag" attack by Israel—the Lavon Affair is an acknowledged event in history, that has been documented even in multiple "mainstream" sources.

But the Lavon Affair was just one of many false flag operations by Israel, and over the years, in the pages of *The Spotlight*, international correspondent Andrew St. George focused on a number of the more notorious incidents. Here are a few of them:

- A shadowy "right wing" group known as "Direct Action" was accused of the attack on Goldenberg's Deli in Paris on August 9, 1982. Six people died and 22 were injured. The leader of "Direct Action" was one Jean-Marc Rouillan who had been operating in the Mediterranean under the cover name of "Sebas" and who had been repeatedly linked to the Mossad. All references to Rouillan's Mossad links were deleted from the official reports issued at the time.

However, the Algerian national news service—which had ties to French intelligence—blamed the Mossad for Rouillan's activities. Angry French intelligence officers were believed to have leaked this information to the Algerians. Several top French security officials quit in protest over this cover-up of Mossad complicity in Rouillan's crimes. However, other Mossad false flag operations also took place on French soil.

- On October 3, 1980 a synagogue on Copernicus Street was bombed in Paris. Four bystanders were killed. Nine were injured. A worldwide media frenzy followed the incident. Reports held that "right wing extremists" were responsible. Yet, all of the "right wing extremists" who were questioned were released. In the upper echelons of French intelligence, the finger of suspicion was pointed at the Mossad.

- On April 6, 1979, the same Mossad terror unit suspected of the Copernicus carnage blew up the heavily guarded plant of CNIM industries in southeast France, where a consortium of French firms was building a nuclear reactor for Iraq. The Mossad salted the site of the bomb blast with "clues" followed up with anonymous phone calls to police suggesting the sabotage was the work of an environmentalist group..

- On June 28, 1978, Israeli agents exploded a bomb under a small passenger car in the Rue Saint Anne, killing Mohammed Boudia, an organizer for the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). Immediately afterward, Paris police received anonymous phone calls accusing Boudia of involvement in narcotics deals and attributing his murder to the Corsican Mafia. A thorough investigation subsequently established that Mossad special-action agents were responsible for the terrorist killing.

- In October, 1976 the same Mossad unit kidnapped two West German students—Brigitte Schulz and Thomas Reuter—in Paris. Planted "clues" and anonymous phone calls made it appear that a Bavarian "neo-nazi" group had executed the abduction. In fact, French intelligence established that the two victims had been flown to Israel, drugged, tortured, coerced into a false "confession of complicity" in PLO activities, and then anonymously incarcerated in an Israeli prison.

- In February 1977 a German-born, naturalized U.S. citizen named William Jahnke arrived in Paris for some secretive business meetings. He soon vanished. Paris police were anonymously informed Jahnke had

been involved in a South Korean bribery affair and "eliminated" when the deal went sour. A special team from SDECE, the leading French intelligence agency, determined Jahnke had been "terminated" by the Mossad, which suspected him of selling secret information to the Libyans. The SDECE learned Jahnke had been "fingering" to the Mossad by his own former employer, the CIA.

- One of Israel's most outrageous "false flag" operations involved a wild propaganda story aimed at discrediting Libyan leader Muamar Qaddafi—one of Israel's favorite enemies. In the early months of the administration of President Ronald Reagan, the American media began heavily promoting a story that a "Libyan hit squad" was in the United States for the express purpose of assassinating Reagan. This inflamed public sentiment against Libya and there were repeated calls for blood.

Suddenly, however, the "hit squad" stories vanished. In fact, it was ultimately discovered that the source of the story was one Manucher Ghorbanifar, a former Iranian SAVAK (secret police) agent with close ties to the Mossad. Even *The Washington Post* acknowledged that the CIA itself believed that Ghorbanifar was a liar who "had made up the hit-squad story in order to cause problems for one of Israel's enemies."

The Los Angeles Times itself had already blown the whistle on Israel's scare stories. "Israeli intelligence, not the Reagan administration," reported the *Times*, "was a major source of some of the most dramatic published reports about a Libyan assassination team allegedly sent to kill President Reagan and other top U.S. officials . . . Israel, which informed sources said has 'wanted an excuse to go in and bash Libya for a long-time,' may be trying to build American public support for a strike against [Qaddafi], these sources said."

In other words, Israel had promoted the former SAVAK agent to Washington as a reliable source. In fact, he was a Mossad disinformation operative waving a "false flag" to mislead America. This was yet another Israeli scheme to blame Libya for its own misdeeds, this time using one "false flag" (Iran's SAVAK) to lay the blame on another "false flag" (Libya).

- Israel's Mossad was almost certainly responsible for the bombing of the La Belle disco in West Berlin on April 5, 1986 in which an American serviceman died. Claims were made that there was "irrefutable" evidence the Libyans were responsible and President Reagan responded with an attack on Libya.

However, intelligence insiders believed the Mossad concocted the "evidence" to "prove" Libyan responsibility. In the end, West Berlin police director Manfred Ganschow cleared the Libyans, saying, "This is a highly political case. Some of the evidence cited in Washington may not be evidence at all, merely assumptions supplied for political reasons."

- On April 18, 1986 one Nezar Hindawi, a 32 year old Jordanian was arrested in London after security guards found that one of the passengers boarding an Israeli plane bound for Jerusalem, Ann Murphy, 22, was carrying a square, flat sheet of plastic explosive in the double bottom of her carry-on bag. Miss Murphy told security men that the detonator (disguised as a calculator) had been given to her by her finance, Hindawi. He was charged with attempted sabotage and attempted murder.

Word was leaked that Hindawi had confessed and claimed that he had been hired by Gen. Mohammed Al-Khouli, the intelligence director of the Syrian air force. Also implicated were others including the Syrian Ambassador in London. The French authorities warned the British Prime Minister there was more to the case—that is, Israeli involvement. This was later confirmed in reports in the Western press.

- In 1970, King Hussein of Jordan was provided with incriminating intelligence that suggested the Palestine Liberation Organization was plotting to murder him and seize power in his nation. Infuriated, Hussein mobilized his forces for what has become known as the 'Black September' purge of the PLO. Thousands of Palestinians living in Jordan were rounded up, some of the leaders were tortured, and in the end, masses of refugees were driven from Jordan to Lebanon.

New data, coming to light after the murder of two leading Mossad operatives in Cyprus suggested that the entire operation had been a Mossad covert action, led by one of its key operatives, Sylvia Roxburgh. She contrived an affair with King Hussein and served as the linchpin for a major Mossad coup designed to destabilize the Arabs.

- In 1982, just when the PLO had abandoned the use of terrorism, the Mossad spread disinformation about "terror attacks" on Israeli settlements along its northern border to justify a full-scale military invasion of Lebanon. Years later, even former Foreign Minister Abba Eban, admitted the reports of "PLO terrorism" had been contrived by the Mossad.

- It is also worth noting that the attempted assassination—in London—of Israel's Ambassador to England, Shlomo Argov, was initially blamed upon the PLO and was cited by Israel as one excuse for its bloody 1982 incursion into Lebanon. In fact, the diplomat was one of Israel's "doves" and inclined toward a friendly disposition of Israel's conflict with the PLO and the least likely target of PLO wrath. What's more, one of the suspects in the crime was found carrying a "hit list" which actually included the name of the head of the PLO office in London.

Thus, it appears that the assassination attempt was carried out by the Mossad—under another "false flag"—for two purposes: (a) elimination of a "peacenik" considered friendly toward the Palestinians; and (b) pinning yet another crime on the Palestine Liberation Organization.

These instances cited here are but a handful of Mossad-orchestrated "false flag" operations blamed on a wide variety of alleged "suspects."

The evidence we shall be examining in the pages that follow suggests that the assassination of John F. Kennedy and later the Oklahoma City bombing and the 9-11 tragedy were additional installments in the ugly, long-standing annals of "false flag" conspiracies by Israel's Mossad.

In the meantime, a final note: At the outset we referenced the fact that many of the false leads that were "planted" prior to the JFK assassination pointed toward the theme that the president's alleged assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald, was a "pro-Castro agitator." This false flag was tailor-made for—or, perhaps we should say, tailor-made *by*—the CIA and its allies in the Mossad. And this is an important point to consider.

However, this requires a bit of background, especially for those who believe the popular story that Fidel Castro was of Jewish origin—a "crypto-Jew" as many have alleged, whether that is true or not.

In fact, the truth is that virtually the entire Jewish community in Cuba fled to Miami and elsewhere when Castro seized power and later became pivotal figures among the anti-Castro Cuban exiles.

Note these facts, for example: Paul Bethel reported in the *Latin America Report (Free Cuba News)* on Dec. 15, 1965 that "Of a total of 11,000 Jews living in Cuba at the time of Castro's takeover, only 1,900 remain. . . . Of the 1,900 remaining . . . 1,300 are being brought to the United States in the current exodus." Bethel noted the remaining 600 Jews were "too old and infirm to leave the country" and that "in terms of population percentage, the flight of Jews from Cuba is greater than that of native-born Cubans," pointing out that many of the Jews in Cuba had settled there after fleeing Europe in the 1930s.

More importantly what few JFK assassination researchers have noted—or perhaps understood—was that Fidel Castro's Cuba was notably hostile to Israel and the cause of Zionism. In a lengthy essay in the November 4, 1979 edition of *Granma*—an official newspaper—the Castro government published the Cuban Marxist critique of Israel and Zionism. Castro's newspaper said, in part:

The Zionists never did, and never will, forgive the Soviet state and its Leninist Party . . . because the Bolsheviks implemented a correct policy that incorporated the talents and efforts of the Soviet Jews into the tasks of building a new society and thus demonstrated the class origins of discrimination and anti-Semitism, breaking with the past and providing a genuine solution to the Jewish problem, a solution which was not and could never be a massive exodus to Palestine.

With the outbreak of the cold war the Zionists collaborated in all the subversive and diversionary activities against the USSR and other socialist countries. The secret services of the Zionist state of Israel coordinated their spy activities with the CIA. And to complete the picture there is the Zionist counter-revolutionary action against the national liberation movements.

The Zionists became a power and succeeded in establishing their own state in 1948. Now their task is to defend oil routes, protect all the interests of U.S. imperialism and block the advance of the Arab revolution. Neither the machinations of Zionist counterrevolution, nor Israeli arms, can hold back the victorious march of the peoples of the world.

These are fighting words, to say the least, and do explain perhaps why those who were responsible for framing Lee Harvey Oswald would have selected his profile as a "pro-Castro agitator." The profile would satisfy both the hard-line anti-communists and the Zionists. Thus, both the Mossad and the CIA would find a "pro-Castro agitator" an ideal patsy in setting up a false flag in the JFK assassination conspiracy.

However, obviously, in subsequent years, as the initial false flag cover story that Oswald was a pro-Castro agitator began to unravel and new fallback targets—new false flags—have been prominent named—primarily "the Mafia."

All along, though, it was the Mossad and its allies in the CIA and in the controlled American media who were doing all the finger-pointing, directing attention to all of those false flags.

At this juncture—having examined the historic use of false flags by Israel in acts of international terror—it's naturally quite important to consider, in retrospect, how the theme of Israeli involvement in the JFK assassination emerged in the first place. And needless to say, it was my book, *Final Judgment*, first published in 1994, that was the first book-length exposition of that theme.

In fact—unbeknown to most Americans, including me—suspicion of Israeli involvement had been rattling around in the Arabic-language media for decades, even going back to the earliest days following the JFK assassination. That Jack Ruby—who killed the president's alleged assassin—was Jewish was the most common theme heard in the Arab press, but that, of course, was hardly proof at all.

In truth, not even those Arab world critics of the Warren Commission had even the slightest inkling of the massive array of details subsequently brought forth in *Final Judgment* and some of which we are about to explore in the pages that follow.

CHAPTER TWO:

A Very Good Question: Where in the World Could Anyone Come Up With the “Unlikely” Theory of Mossad Involvement in the JFK Assassination?

Considering all of the theories about the assassination of John F. Kennedy that have been circulating for years, how could anyone ever suggest that Israel's Mossad was involved?

This was the (not surprising) reaction of more than a few people when apprised of the thesis presented in the pages of *Final Judgment*.

The truth is that there were even many people who were critics of Israel (and more than a few unabashed anti-Semites as well) who told me, flat out, that they thought that I was, as some put it, “reaching.”

However, I think it's safe to say, that virtually 100% of those who told me that they were initially skeptical about my thesis came around in the end, after having read the book, and said, “You may be right.”

Many of those who had their doubts could simply not believe that “the Jews” would have anything to do with the assassination of John F. Kennedy, a liberal icon. Many of my initial critics said, “The Jews loved Kennedy. He was their boy. The Kennedys have been in bed with the Jews for years,” and put forth similar expressions of that kind. Even today there are those critics who still maintain that position.

However, more recently, growing recognition and understanding of JFK's long-secret war with Israel over nuclear weapons (and of his efforts to curtail the power of the Israeli lobby in Washington)—some of it stimulated, I might note with all due modesty, by the widespread distribution of *Final Judgment*—has erased at least some doubts about the viability of the thesis first enunciated in *Final Judgment*: that of Israeli complicity in the president's murder.

All of that having been said, it's important, at this juncture, to explain precisely how I began an evolution in thinking regarding the JFK assassination—a subject of long-standing interest on my part—that led me to the research and writing of *Final Judgment* and presenting the controversial conclusion that appears in its pages.

Having read, over a period of some 20 years, most of the preeminent literature regarding the controversy, I had concluded that the CIA, in league with elements of “the Mafia” and anti-Castro Cuban exiles, had been responsible for the president's murder.

And having been employed by *The Spotlight* newspaper in 1985 at the time of its successful defeat of ex-CIA man E. Howard Hunt, who had sued our newspaper over an article suggesting that he was about to be

framed for the CIA for involvement in the JFK assassination—an article which did not, by the way, say that he had actually been involved in the assassination—I had the additional golden opportunity to have an “inside” view of that affair and its relation to the long-standing controversy surrounding the assassination. (Later, in these pages, we’ll discuss the Hunt-*Spotlight* case and its ultimate ramifications in further detail.)

In any event, over the years, I nonetheless continued to delve into new research surrounding the assassination and to re-read previous works on the topic, refreshing my memory on earlier research. But I didn’t expect to discover anything that would re-orient my thinking regarding the idea that the JFK assassination was essentially a CIA-Mafia-Cuban exiles operation.

How wrong I was.

It was in 1989, while re-reading A. J. Weberman and Michael Canfield's *Coup d'Etat in America* (first published in 1975) that I first stumbled upon a strange reference that ultimately led to my research outlined in *Final Judgment*.

And what is of particular interest is that this very singular detail appearing in the Weberman-Canfield book was one of the details I subsequently came to recognize—in the wake of the Oklahoma City bombing and later with the 9-11 tragedy—that pointed toward the “template for terror” I now contend was utilized by the Mossad not only in the JFK assassination, but in the Oklahoma bombing and in 9-11

And once you’ve heard the entirety of my presentation in these pages, I think you’ll agree.

The reference in the Weberman-Canfield book, simple as it was, appearing on page 41, read as follows:

After the assassination, an informer for the Secret Service and the FBI who had infiltrated a Cuban exile group and was in the process of selling them machine guns, reported that on November 21, 1963 he was told, “We now have plenty of money—*our new backers are the Jews*—as soon as *they* take care of JFK.” This man had furnished reliable information in the past. (Emphasis added.)

I barely noticed the reference, but it did intrigue me. Who did this source mean by “the Jews” and why (of all people) would “they” want to “take care of JFK”?

After all, I had always been told that JFK was a favorite of the Jews and that, in fact, it was most likely Jewish votes that gave JFK the narrow margin of victory in the 1960 election.

The source didn't just say that the new backers of the exile group in question were "Jews." The source said that he was told that the new backers were "the Jews," the emphasis being on the word "the" which, of course, could suggest that the Jews in question were acting as Jews, that is, on behalf of particularly Jewish interests.

But I didn't spend too much time thinking about the subject, which may surprise some of my critics who contend that I spend too much time thinking about the Jews and their misdeeds.

So it was that I concluded that the source meant Jewish gangsters such as Meyer Lansky who wanted to regain the Cuban gambling interests they lost when Castro came to power.

Frankly, I laid the speculation aside. It was just one lone detail among millions of words written about the JFK assassination.

Nearly a year went by before I came across the reference again—while re-reading the same book. I pondered the quote for a moment, thinking, "This *is* interesting."

But—once again—I cast it aside.

However, an entire year later—sometime in 1991—I came across a variation of the same quotation cited in the book by Weberman and Canfield. This time it appeared in David Scheim's book, *Contract on America*, which contends "The Mafia Killed JFK" and which also vehemently dismisses any CIA involvement whatsoever.

The truth is that I had read Scheim's book when it first came out in 1988, but I had not noticed the reference (or the similarity to the other one in the Weberman-Canfield book) at that time.

What intrigued me, however, was that upon re-reading Scheim's rendition of the quote and comparing it to the similar reference in the Weberman-Canfield book, I discovered that *Scheim had deleted the reference to the alleged Jewish backers of the Cuban plotters.*

Naturally, my immediate thought was: "What's Scheim trying to hide? What did he edit that reference?"

Now because Scheim is Jewish one might suggest that he was simply trying to avoid raising any unpleasant suspicions about Jewish people since the reference in question did, in fact, allude to Jewish people—that is, "the Jews"—allegedly planning to "take care of JFK."

After all, many will argue, the Jews have suffered tremendously through the ages and have been falsely accused of many crimes. Perhaps Shine was acting out of good motives.

But then again—one might ask in the alternative—if Scheim was a genuine truth-seeker, why would he permit his personal bias (or concern about the sensitivities of Jewish folks) lead him to the actual censorship of apparently factual material relating to the conspiracy.

After all, not even A. J. Weberman (who was active in the Jewish Defense League for some years) chose to delete the reference to "the Jews." But Scheim did.

These were some of the thoughts that ran through my mind back in 1991 as I struggled over this unusual reference.

It was, however, at that moment, that I finally began to see that this unusual (seemingly minor) detail might, in fact, point toward something much bigger than I had realized.

It was at this time that a new biography of organized crime figure Meyer Lansky was released. Entitled *Little Man: Meyer Lansky and the Gangster Life*, the book—prepared in cooperation with Lansky's family—was little more than a puff piece for Lansky. I realized immediately that the book still somehow seemed to be missing quite a lot.

It was then that I returned to my library and pulled a book off the shelf that I hadn't re-read in perhaps fifteen years. It was Hank Messick's biography of Lansky—entitled simply *Lansky*. Re-reading this important book I began to see that Meyer Lansky was not just a Mafia advisor as David Scheim, for example, would have his readers believe. Instead, Lansky was "the chairman of the board" of organized crime. All of the Mafia figures that had been repeatedly implicated in the JFK assassination were, in fact, Lansky's front men—his subordinates, his underlings.

In short, if "the Mafia" had a hand in the killing of JFK, then Lansky had to have been one of the key players. Yet, as I quickly began to see in reviewing many of the works which allege that "The Mafia Killed JFK," Lansky's preeminent role in the crime syndicate was being ignored or otherwise under-played.

While I was aware of Lansky's long-standing ties to Israel—he had even fled to Israel when the heat was on in the United States—my research into the question of the Lansky-Israeli connection began to turn up some interesting facts.

At this juncture, however, I had no reason to think that Israel would have had any reason to participate in the JFK assassination conspiracy. However, it was just about the time that I had begun to take a second look at the Lansky connection—in 1991—that several new works were released which provided never-before revealed information about the covert relationship between the United States and Israel.

These books, cited extensively in *Final Judgment*, made it all too clear that JFK had become embroiled in a bitter behind-the-scenes battle with Israel. In fact, Kennedy was at war. JFK's secret war with Israel was something that even long-time JFK assassination researchers had no reason to know about. Much of the material had long been classified. It was a secret—a deep, dark secret.

Some of JFK's communications with then-Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion were classified for years, released only for the first time in 1994 (just shortly after the first edition of *Final Judgment* was published.) Not even top-level intelligence officials with special security clearance had been allowed access to those explosive documents.

In fact, prior to those more recent revelations, very little about JFK's relations with Israel and the Arab world had ever actually been published anywhere. As historian David Schoenbaum (who is, by the way, Jewish) pointed out quite notably in his book, *The United States and the State of Israel*:

Submerged among the high-visibility themes of East-West relations, the nuclear arms race and the early dawn of a test ban and nonproliferation, the Berlin and Cuban missile crisis, the perplexities of the newly decolonized Belgian Congo, buoyant hopes for an Alliance for Progress in Latin America, and the deepening quagmire in Vietnam, *the Middle East is scarcely even visible in the standard biographies that followed Kennedy's assassination*. Even by liberal estimates, Ben-Gurion and Nasser, Israel and Egypt appear on only seven each of Theodore Sorensen's 758, and Arthur M. Schlesinger's 1,031 pages of text. [Emphasis added.]

In short, while JFK assassination researchers were busy probing a wide variety of areas, they were missing the big picture—the secret picture on the other side of the jigsaw puzzle.

So it was that the new revelations about Kennedy's relationship with Israel made me realize that there was an unexplored area of research—never before considered—that needed examination.

By this time, then, in 1991, the long and close relationship between Israel and JFK's foes at the CIA was something that was now being acknowledged. And JFK's own war with the CIA was already common knowledge. At the time of the JFK assassination, however, the depth and breadth of the CIA's relationship with Israel's Mossad, however, was not so commonly known.

The pieces of the puzzle were all there. They simply needed to be put together. With a basic thesis now evolving in my mind, I began re-reading much of the published information about the JFK assassination, his policy toward Israel and the history of organized crime.

And in so doing, I repeatedly found myself stumbling upon new information that continued to verify what was initially in my mind just a theory, but which I now believe to be the truth.

By December of 1992 I realized that I had more than just a working thesis, but, in fact, *enough material for a book* and I began to write it.

But even as I was already in the process of writing the book, I was startled by the vast amount of material that I was continually uncovering—and virtually all of it was *in the pages of mainstream sources freely available to anyone who cared to do the research*. I thus began to realize that I had indeed begun to assemble a remarkable wealth of material that brought my initial thesis full circle.

However, one of the problems with writing a book is that no matter how hard an author researches his subject, he's bound to miss a few significant items the first time around.

Since *Final Judgment* was first released in 1994, I've repeatedly kicked myself for having passed by more than a few such details that I believe lend credence to the theory that the book put forth.

Up through and including the fourth edition of *Final Judgment*, I repeatedly made the point that former New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison—who prosecuted trade executive and longtime CIA asset Clay Shaw for conspiracy in the JFK assassination—had no inkling of any Mossad connection to the assassination.

However, after the fourth edition of *Final Judgment* was released in 1998, I discovered (to my delight) that I was wrong:

I made the somewhat unsettling discovery that Garrison apparently did indeed realize that the Mossad was connected to the conspiracy—and the information had been there for me to find it, if I had looked in the right place several years before when I first began my research.

Although I had, in fact, on multiple occasions, scanned the quite extensive Internet web site of the aforementioned veteran JFK assassination researcher A. J. Weberman (www.weberman.com) I found something which amazed me, to say the least. On his web site, Weberman made the following remarkable assertion:

This researcher knew Jim Garrison in the mid-1970's. Garrison wanted me to find a publisher for a manuscript he had written on the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

When I read the manuscript I found that it was a fictional work that placed the blame for John Kennedy's death on the Mossad—the Israeli intelligence service.

Considering all the grief to which I had been subjected over the past several years—even including criticism coming from some defenders of the Garrison investigation—I could barely believe what I had read. If A. J. Weberman is to be believed, Jim Garrison himself had figured

out—somehow, not surprisingly—that there was good reason to believe that the Mossad had been involved in the crime of the century.

But Garrison himself evidently concluded (quite correctly, I might add) that it was not in his interests to say so—at least not publicly and certainly not in any of his non-fiction writings on the subject. So Garrison decided instead to put his thesis in a novel, but it was a novel that obviously was never published.

Although Garrison did publish a JFK assassination-related novel, entitled *The Star-Spangled Contract*, it did not—I repeat did *not*—allude to Mossad involvement. So if that book was the novel that Weberman saw in unpublished form, Garrison obviously deleted any references to Israel or the Mossad in its final version.

I doubt that Garrison's family will be attempting to put the original unpublished manuscript (if it still exists) on the market any time soon.

Weberman's revelation makes many defenders of Jim Garrison uncomfortable, but it does provide astounding confirmation that the thesis put forth in *Final Judgment* does have some genuine support from a figure who has become an icon in the lore of the JFK assassination conspiracy.

Garrison's reported theorizing of Mossad involvement does not, of course, *prove* that the Mossad was involved in the JFK assassination, but it does lend credence to what has been so widely criticized (but without refutation, I might add) in *Final Judgment*.

The question, naturally, arises: Was Weberman lying about Garrison's Mossad theory, and if so, why would Weberman make this allegation? This is not for me to answer. I am only here to tell you that this is what Weberman has said.

If Weberman was not lying, are we then to believe that Garrison was simply having some sort of twisted fun, that Garrison concocted this scenario for his own peculiar purposes?

This, of course, seems highly unlikely.

Thus we are left with the fact of what Weberman has alleged about Garrison's apparent suppositions, coupled with the reality that *Final Judgment* has now come forth documenting the "how" and the "why" of Mossad involvement in the JFK assassination conspiracy.

And as much as it may dismay Israel—and its lobby in America represented by the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) and other powerful forces—there are a lot of people (in growing numbers) who do believe *Final Judgment* presents a scenario that does make sense, one that makes as much sense or more than many of the other standard theories on the subject, the ADL's hysterical efforts to silence me (but not refute me) notwithstanding.

So despite the subtitle of my book—"the missing link in the JFK assassination conspiracy"—it seems that, in a sense, I actually initially missed "the missing link in the JFK assassination conspiracy"—the fact that Jim Garrison had indeed recognized the Mossad connection.

And as I documented in *Final Judgment*—and discuss later in these pages—the very individual prosecuted by Garrison, the aforementioned Clay Shaw, was connected in more ways than one to definitive Israeli (and pro-Israel) elements that were either a direct part of the assassination conspiracy or otherwise tied to the Israeli nuclear weapons program that JFK was working so assiduously to stop dead in its tracks.

However, it goes even further . . .

Once again, after the publication of *Final Judgment*, I had occasion to learn that Jim Garrison and I were far from having been alone in having come to suspect Mossad involvement in the JFK assassination.

It was thanks to a sincere JFK researcher who was not afraid to consider the possibility of Mossad involvement in the assassination that I learned that yet another prominent (and particularly respected) figure in the JFK research community had also talked of an Israeli connection to the conspiracy—and not just privately, but publicly.

In this case, it was the late Texas newsman Penn Jones, the scrappy, no-nonsense publisher of *The Midlothian Mirror* and one of the most outspoken early critics of the Warren Commission and long revered as a tower of integrity by virtually all independent JFK researchers. Even the ubiquitous John Judge—who has been a hateful and fanatical critic of *Final Judgment* and me personally—called Jones "an honest journalist" who "did much original research on the case."

The truth is that as far back as 1968—sixteen years before *Final Judgment* was first published—Penn Jones was suggesting that JFK researchers start looking into Mossad connections as far as the JFK conspiracy was concerned.

That's right.

Penn Jones—not Michael Collins Piper—said it.

This is something those who admire Jones—but who fear mentioning "the Mossad" in relation to the JFK assassination—find difficult to acknowledge, for it suggests *Final Judgment* may be on target after all.

In a *Midlothian Mirror* column (dated January 18, 1968) and later published on page 51 in the 1969 edition of volume III of Jones' *Forgive My Grief* series, Jones wrote:

Jack Ruby was a close intimate of the members of the Dallas Police force and other United States law enforcement agencies, as well as the Israeli counter intelligence organization.

His one-time employee, Nancy Zeigman Perrin Rich was also close to these same forces.

Identifying Ruby and Nancy as being involved with the Israeli intelligence opens up a completely overlooked area concerning the assassination of President Kennedy.

Jones's disclosure somehow seems to have been lost—or, dare we say, purposely ignored and suppressed—in all of the minutiae surrounding inquiries into the JFK assassination

Some years later, in a *Midlothian Mirror* column (dated February 24, 1972) and then republished on page 54 in the 1974 edition of volume IV of Jones' *Forgive My Grief* series, Jones wrote further:

[Jack] Ruby was admittedly used by the FBI in small time information gathering, but he appears to have been a bigger operative for some other agency or country . . .

There are many indications in the Warren hearings and other places that Ruby, and "Honest Joe" Goldstein were intelligence operatives in a small way for someone. And Abe Weinstein's Colony Club seems to have been used at times as a "safe house" for operatives.

And considering what we now know of multiple Israeli connections in Dallas and in Texas—which we will explore further in these pages—it is likely that these other Jewish entrepreneurs may have also worked for the Mossad, just as Jones had suggested Ruby had done.

We owe a great deal to Penn Jones for not hesitating to dare to mention "Israel" in a less-than-flattering context, in this case, involvement in the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

So—yet again—in the work of Penn Jones we find a little-noticed "Israeli connection" in JFK lore that has somehow been "misplaced."

This overview of my own discovery of a likely Israeli connection to the JFK assassination is really, in many respects, only the tip of the iceberg, but, as we proceed further, the immense amount of material that points in that direction will become apparent.

And by the conclusion of this present volume, I think it will become clear to the readers why when—back in 1989—I came across the passing reference to the "the Jews" in the Weberman-Canfield book, it does seem that I did indeed stumble upon not only the Israeli link to the JFK assassination, but also to the key to understanding the template for terror that was used in that crime but also later in the Oklahoma City bombing and in the 9-11 tragedy that followed.

CHAPTER THREE:

JFK's Secret War With Israel: The Untold Story of How the Controversy Over Israel's Nuclear Ambitions Was Central to the JFK Assassination Conspiracy.

Did John F. Kennedy's determined (and then secret) behind-the-scenes efforts to prevent Israel from building a nuclear weapons arsenal play a pivotal part in the events that led to his assassination on November 22, 1963?

Was Israel's intelligence service, the Mossad, a front-line player in the JFK assassination conspiracy alongside elements of the CIA and international organized crime?

With worldwide attention focused on the problems of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East—is it appropriate to raise the question of possible Israeli complicity in the assassination of an American president?

These are just a few of the questions posed in my 1994 book, *Final Judgment*, which emerged as a proverbial “underground best-seller” in the United States, the topic of heated debate on the Internet and the subject of angry exchanges in a variety of public forums.

What follows is a summary of my findings in *Final Judgment*, which—now being readied for its expanded Seventh Edition—is a 768-page volume documented with more than 1000 reference notes, an extensive question-and-answer section, 36 pages of photographs and charts, and ten appendices focusing on different aspects of the JFK conspiracy.

Obviously, this overview—in contrast to a 768-page book—can hardly provide the reader even an inkling of the vast amount of heavily-footnoted material appearing in *Final Judgment* (all of which underscores the basic assertions put forth here) but, naturally, those who are interested in the entirety of the story (and the documentation therefor) are referred to *Final Judgment*.

However, for the benefit of the readers of *False Flags*, I feel compelled to provide at least this basic introduction to the comprehensive assembly of data that first appeared in *Final Judgment*.

(All things being equal—God willing—a new and expanded edition of *Final Judgment* will be available in the near future, but for the present, this brief overview of its thesis will have to suffice.)

That having been said, let us move forward and review precisely what *Final Judgment* does say about the parameters of the JFK assassination conspiracy and thereby set the stage for a more in-depth examination of the actual (and quite astounding) “template for terror” used to effect the murder of America's 35th president.

In 1992, former Rep. Paul Findley, a liberal Republican, made the little-noticed but intriguing comment that “in all the words written about the assassination of John F. Kennedy, Israel’s intelligence agency, the Mossad, has never been mentioned, despite the obvious fact Mossad complicity is as plausible as any of the other theories.”

Where in the world could Findley—never known to be an extremist, by any means, and certainly not one given to venting conspiracy theories—have ever come up with such an assertion?

Actually, it’s not so extraordinary a thesis, if one looks at the historical record, placing all of the conventional theories about the JFK assassination in a new perspective, factoring in previously-little known details that shed stark light on the circumstances surrounding JFK’s demise and the geopolitical crises in which the American president was embroiled at the time of his murder.

Not even Oliver Stone’s 1993 blockbuster film, *JFK*—the most widely-disseminated and dramatic exposition of JFK assassination theorizing ever before seen by the American public—presented the entirety of the picture, for reasons which will soon be obvious.

A far-reaching cinematic interpretation of the widely-publicized and hotly controversial 1967-1969 JFK assassination inquiry by then-New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison, Stone’s film focused on Garrison’s prosecution of a prominent New Orleans socialite—trade executive Clay Shaw—for involvement in the JFK conspiracy.

Garrison had stumbled upon Shaw in the course of investigating the activities of alleged JFK assassin Lee Harvey Oswald who had spent the summer in New Orleans just prior to the assassination. And Garrison had come to conclude that Oswald had some sort of murky association with Shaw (and an odd assortment of others associated with Shaw) in activities linked to the CIA’s covert war against Fidel Castro, much of which was being conducted out of New Orleans. Dozens of writers—many with differing points of view—have documented all of this, time and again, in the years following the Garrison investigation.

At the time, Garrison suspected Shaw was some sort of intelligence operative but he was unable to prove it during the trial. In the end, after a brief deliberation, the jury hearing the case acquitted Shaw. It was only later evidence emerged that Shaw had indeed been a CIA asset, Shaw’s protestations to the contrary.

In more recent years its also been discovered that the CIA was sabotaging Garrison’s investigation from within, not to mention providing assistance to Shaw’s defense. And although there are those who continue to say Shaw’s acquittal “proved” Shaw had nothing whatsoever to do with the JFK conspiracy, the bigger picture suggests quite the contrary.

To this day, Garrison's critics continue to assert (as they did at the time) that the colorful and rambunctious prosecutor couldn't make up his mind as to whom he thought had orchestrated the assassination of President Kennedy. This was the primary complaint against Garrison: that he simply couldn't make up his mind.

And this is one of the reasons even many of Garrison's supporters not only began to question his sincerity, but even as to whether Garrison's investigation was even worth the trouble.

At one time or another, during the course of that investigation, Garrison pointed his finger at one or another various possible conspirators—ranging from “right-wing extremists” to “Texas oil barons” to “anti-Castro Cuban exiles” to “rogue CIA operatives.” Occasionally Garrison went so far as to say that the conspiracy included a combination of those possible conspirators.

In truth, Garrison did tend to shoot from the hip. That may have been his biggest mistake—one of many—in the course of his controversial inquiry into the murder of America's 35th president.

When Garrison finally brought one man to trial, widely respected Clay Shaw, Garrison had narrowed his field, suggesting, primarily, that Shaw had been one of the lower-level players in the conspiracy.

According to Garrison, Shaw was essentially doing the bidding of highly-placed figures in what has been described as “the military-industrial complex,” that combination of financial interests and armaments manufacturers whose power and influence in official Washington—and around the world—is a very real force in global affairs.

Garrison suggested that Shaw and his co-conspirators had multiple motivations stimulating their decision to move against President Kennedy. Among other things, he asserted:

- The conspirators opposed JFK's decision to begin withdrawing U.S. forces from Indochina;
- They were angry at his failure to provide military cover support for Cuban exiles attempting to topple Fidel Castro in the botched Bay of Pigs invasion;
- They were bitter at JFK for firing longtime CIA Director Allen Dulles, a grand old man of the Cold War against the Soviet Union; and
- In addition, Garrison hinted, JFK's successor, Lyndon Johnson, may have wanted JFK removed from office for the purpose of claiming the crown for himself.

In the course of his film on the Garrison affair, Oliver Stone did have occasion to bring one aspect of Clay Shaw's covert life as an intelligence operative to the attention of his audience, but even that reference was relatively oblique, to say the least.

Stone referenced—but only in passing—Shaw's membership on the board of directors of a shadowy Rome-based corporate shell known as Permindex—a subsidiary of yet another entity, the Centro Mondiale Commerciale—which Stone portrayed as essentially a front for the CIA.

However, as the evidence clearly demonstrates (and which details were thoroughly outlined in *Final Judgment*) this operation known as Permindex was, in fact, a front for an Israeli Mossad-sponsored arms procurement operation linked at multiple levels to Israel's super-secret nuclear arms acquisition program.

It is the Permindex connection which is the tie that binds—the final proof the Mossad was at the center of the JFK conspiracy.

And—as we shall see—in Permindex we find all of the critical elements tying the Mossad, the CIA and the Jewish Crime Syndicate together in close-knit intrigue linked directly to the conspiracy.

Although researchers have devoted much energy to pursuing a wide variety of questions relating to the JFK assassination (focusing on many matters that will never be resolved) most have steered clear of Permindex, even including some who have otherwise been supporters of the work of Jim Garrison notwithstanding.

In a more ridiculous realm, there are some JFK assassination researchers who would have us believe that Permindex was some sort of remnant of the Third Reich.

But nothing could be further from the truth.

In fact, understanding the forces behind Permindex is the key to resolving the biggest mystery of this century: the question of not only who killed John F. Kennedy—but why.

As such, beginning in the mid-1980s and well into the present day, new evidence has emerged that not only points to good reason for Mossad motivation to move against John F. Kennedy, but also to the likelihood that not only Clay Shaw (Jim Garrison's target) but other key figures often associated in published writings with the JFK assassination were indeed closely tied to the Mossad and doing its bidding, although in many—if not most, cases—were not even Jewish.

But Mossad complicity—as the record indicates—is a very real possibility. And although during the Clay Shaw trial, Garrison believed the CIA and the military-industrial complex were the prime movers behind JFK's murder, when all was said and done, Garrison himself—as we noted in the previous chapter—ultimately (albeit privately) reached a quite different conclusion, one that remains largely unknown even to many who have otherwise supported Garrison.

In fact, Garrison had decided that the most likely masterminds of the JFK assassination were operatives of Israel's intelligence service, the

Mossad. Whether he reached his conclusion on the basis of having pursued Shaw's Israeli ties through Permindex or whether he was apprised of other information that we don't know about (and probably never will) is a question that remains unanswered.

So although Garrison perhaps didn't know it at the time, *he was on to something*, perhaps far more than he realized.

The public record now demonstrates that in 1963 JFK was embroiled in a bitter secret conflict with Israeli leader David Ben-Gurion over Israel's drive to build the atomic bomb; that Ben-Gurion resigned in disgust, saying that because of JFK's policies, Israel's "existence [was] in danger."

Then upon JFK's assassination, U.S. policy toward Israel took an immediate 180-degree turn.

With all of this in mind, we have good reason to understand why Oliver Stone chose not to pursue the Mossad connections of the Permindex operation or to ever acknowledge (at least publicly) the fact of John F. Kennedy's biggest and most politically sensitive (but least known) behind the scenes conflict: JFK's determined struggle to prevent Israel from building a nuclear arsenal.

The truth is that the executive producer—the money man—behind Stone's film was Arnon Milchan, one of the biggest industrialists and arms dealers in Israel, with a long history of high-level involvement in Israel's nuclear weapons program, the very point of contention between President Kennedy and Israeli Prime Minister Ben-Gurion.

Israeli historian Avner Cohen's 1998 book, *Israel and the Bomb*, confirms the conflict between JFK and Israel so powerfully that Israel's preeminent newspaper, *Ha'aretz*, declared that Cohen's revelations would "necessitate the rewriting of Israel's entire history."

From Israel's perspective, wrote Cohen, "Kennedy's demands [on Israel] seemed diplomatically inappropriate . . . inconsistent with national sovereignty." In any case, Cohen pointed out, "the transition from Kennedy to [Lyndon] Johnson . . . benefited the Israeli nuclear program."

Reviewing Cohen's book in *The New York Times*, Ethan Bronner called Israel's drive to build a nuclear bomb "a fiercely hidden subject."

This explains (at least in part) why JFK researchers—even Jim Garrison at first—never considered an Israeli connection to the crime.

So all of this obviously presents a strong motive for Israel to strike against JFK; even maverick Israeli journalist Barry Chamish has grudgingly acknowledged that there exists "a pretty cogent case" for Mossad collaboration with the CIA in the assassination conspiracy.

The fact is that when Jim Garrison prosecuted Clay Shaw for conspiracy in the JFK assassination, Garrison had stumbled upon a pivotal

Mossad link to the president's murder, one tied directly to the nuclear arms conflict between JFK and Israel.

How and why Shaw happened to end up in association with the Israeli operation known as Permindex is really no longer a mystery.

Since the publication of the first edition of *Final Judgment*, it has been revealed that Shaw's closest friends in New Orleans—the powerful Stern family, leaders in that city's Jewish community—were among the primary shareholders in the Apollo, Pennsylvania-based NUMEC nuclear facility that was documented by multiple mainstream sources as the venue from which American nuclear material was illicitly channeled to Israel by NUMEC's founder, Dr. Zalman Shapiro, in collaboration with the CIA's chief of counterintelligence, James Jesus Angleton, a devoted ally of Israel as head of the Mossad liaison desk at the CIA.

And, it should be added, many JFK researchers have documented—although avoiding the Mossad connection to the JFK assassination—that Angleton was most assuredly one of the key CIA players in the JFK assassination conspiracy, most notably being the CIA official who was directly responsible for overseeing the CIA's long-standing covert ties to the JFK assassination patsy, Lee Harvey Oswald.

And one further point: It is surely no coincidence that the Stern family also provided the funds for Shaw's legal defense in the criminal prosecution of Shaw conducted by Jim Garrison.

This same Stern family were likewise the owners of WDSU radio and television broadcasting in New Orleans. These just happen to be the very media outlets which publicized Lee Harvey Oswald as a pro-Castro agitator in New Orleans in the summer of 1963 at precisely the time when many JFK assassination researchers believe the Stern family's friend, Clay Shaw, was acting an intelligence "handler" for Oswald.

In any event, the clear role of the Mossad in the activities of Permindex (on whose board Clay Shaw served) is beyond question, protestations notwithstanding.

The evidence is strong indeed. Judge for yourself.

A primary shareholder in Permindex, the Banque De Credit Internationale of Geneva, was not only the fiefdom of Tibor Rosenbaum, a high-level and longtime Mossad official—indeed, one of the founding fathers of Israel—but also the chief money laundry for Meyer Lansky, "chairman" of the crime syndicate and long-time Israeli loyalist.

According to Meyer Lansky's sympathetic Israeli biographers: "After Israel became a state, almost 90 percent of its purchases of arms abroad was channeled through Rosenbaum's bank. The financing of many of Israel's most daring secret operations was carried out through the funds in [BCI]." BCI also served as a depository for the Permindex account.

That Tibor Rosenbaum's BCI was a controlling force behind the enigmatic Permindex entity places Israel and its Mossad at the very center of the conspiracy behind the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

Note also that the chief executive and shareholder of Permindex was Louis Bloomfield of Montreal, an attorney, diplomat and industrialist and a top figure in the Israeli lobby in Canada and a longtime operative of the family of World Jewish Congress chief Samuel Bronfman—an intimate Lansky partner in the international traffic in bootleg whiskey during Prohibition and, much later, a leading patron of Israel.

In addition, Bloomfield is now known to have been an attorney handling legal matters for the Rothschild family, Israel's foremost international patrons.

It is likewise no coincidence that Bloomfield and the Bronfmans were among a group of American and Canadian Jewish millionaires (and billionaires) who bankrolled Israel's nuclear weapons program to the tune of \$40 million in the 1950s (\$250 million today). Israeli Prime Minister considered Israel's nuclear weapons program to be "sacred," referring to those Jewish financiers as "consecrators," implicitly suggesting they were contributing to a "sacred" program, holy in nature!

Permindex was clearly the Israeli link to the JFK assassination. The Permindex link also explains the "French connection" featured in the popular documentary *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*, but which failed to tell the entire story:

- That Permindex was also involved in assassination attempts against French President Charles DeGaulle by the French "Secret Army Organization" (OAS) which itself had close ties to the Mossad.

- Like the OAS, the Israelis hated DeGaulle not only because he gave independence to Algeria, a major new Arab state, but also because DeGaulle, who had assisted Israel, had withdrawn support, objecting (as did JFK) to Israel's drive for an atomic arsenal.

- A French intelligence officer alleged to this author, in 1993, that the Mossad contracted out at least one of JFK's assassins—probably a Corsican hitman—through a French intelligence official disloyal to DeGaulle and who hated JFK for supporting Algerian independence.

There is also firm evidence—based on revelations by the late respected journalist Stewart Alsop—that JFK was also planning a strike against Red China's nuclear bomb program—a plan scuttled by Lyndon Johnson within a month of JFK's assassination.

During this same period—according to famed British intelligence historian Donald McCormack, (writing under his *nom de plume*, Richard Deacon, in his book, *The Israeli Secret Service*)—Israel and Red China were involved in joint secret nuclear bomb research.

We also now know, in addition, that a key player in the Permindex web, billionaire Israeli industrialist Shaul Eisenberg, emerged as the Mossad's liaison with China and ultimately played the key role in developing the massive global weapons transfers between Israel and China that came to public attention in the 1980s.

And is not incidental that James Angleton, the CIA liaison to the Mossad, was a devoted partisan of Israel who—prior to the assassination—orchestrated the scenario linking accused assassin Lee Oswald to the Soviet KGB (and to Castro's Cuba).

In addition, after the assassination—as we shall see in more detail later in these pages—Angleton circulated disinformation to confuse investigations into the assassination.

The tales of Angleton's intrigues with the Mossad during the Cold War are legion but only more recently has his connection to the JFK assassination become more broadly understood.

As far as the oft-discussed "Mafia" connection to the JFK assassination, even "mainstream" sources on organized crime note that the Italian-American "Mafia" figures most often accused of being behind the assassination—Carlos Marcello of New Orleans and Santo Trafficante of Tampa, Florida—were actually subordinates of Mossad-associated Meyer Lansky. Marcello and Trafficante reported to Lansky—not vice versa.

In addition, the nephew-namesake of the Chicago Mafia boss, Sam Giancana—also often fingered as a possible sponsor of the JFK assassination—has asserted that the real boss of the Chicago Mafia was an American Jewish associate of Meyer Lansky—one Hyman "Hal" Lerner—who, while pulling the strings of Giancana and the Chicago mob, was also collaborating in international intrigue with Israel's Mossad.

It is no wonder some critics suggest that perhaps Oliver Stone failed to mention these details in *JFK* because his film was financed by Arnon Milchan, an Israeli arms dealer-turned-Hollywood producer whom even CBS's "Sixty Minutes" has linked to smuggling of materiel to Israel's nuclear program—which, of course, just happened to be the bitter central point of contention between JFK and Israel.

Although Israeli diplomat Uri Palti has declared all of this—as outlined in *Final Judgment*—to be "nonsense," and CIA-connected author Gerald Posner branded it "outlandish," and stridently pro-Israel conservative columnist George Will declared it "vicious intellectual licentiousness," *The Los Angeles Times* grudgingly admitted in 1997 that the thesis of *Final Judgment* was "novel indeed," saying it "weave[s] together some of the key threads in a tapestry that many say is unique."

And it should be noted, that although there are many who do believe that the CIA had a hand in the JFK assassination, quite a few of

those same people are fearful of mentioning a Mossad role. Yet, as journalist Andrew Cockburn has pointed out:

There has been since almost the earliest days of the Israeli state and the earliest days of the CIA a secret bond, basically by which Israeli intelligence did jobs for the CIA and for the rest of American intelligence.

You can't understand what's been going on with American covert operations and the Israeli covert operations until you understand this secret arrangement.

There are at least three major books, by well-known journalists, who document the subterranean links between the CIA and the Mossad, not to mention aspects of JFK's bitter conflict with Israel, not only over nuclear arms policy, but over U.S. Middle East policy in general:

1) *The Samson Option: Israel's Nuclear Arsenal and American Foreign Policy* by Pulitzer Prize-winning veteran New York *Times* correspondent Seymour Hersh.

2) *Dangerous Liaison: The Inside Story of the U.S.-Israeli Covert Relationship* by husband-and-wife team, Andrew and Leslie Cockburn, both respected liberal journalists; and

3) *Taking Sides: America's Secret Relations With a Militant Israel* by Stephen Green, who has been associated with the very "mainstream" Council on Foreign Relations and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Hersh and Green, by the way, are Jewish. All three books were published by well-known publishing houses not generally perceived to be outlets for anti-Israel or anti-Semitic screeds.

These volumes make it very clear that JFK and Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion were at serious loggerheads, to the point Ben-Gurion believed JFK's policy was a threat to Israel's very survival—and said so.

In addition, these volumes demonstrate U.S. policy did a drastic 180-degree turn upon the death of President Kennedy: the most immediate result of the American president's murder—a cold, hard fact not subject to dispute. The evidence is all too clear.

Hersh has noted that the Israeli press and the world press "told the world that Ben-Gurion's sudden resignation was a result of his dissatisfaction with domestic political scandals that were rocking Israel."

However, Hersh went on to say, quite significantly, that there was "no way for the Israeli public" to know that there was "yet another factor" behind the resignation: specifically, in Hersh's words, Ben-Gurion's "increasingly bitter impasse with Kennedy over a nuclear-armed Israel."

The final showdown with JFK over the nuclear bomb was clearly, the "primary reason" behind Ben-Gurion's resignation.

And as the record shows, the drive to build a nuclear bomb was not only a major aim of Israel's defense policy (its very foundation) but also a special interest and concern of Ben-Gurion.

In any event, Hersh's revelations about JFK and Ben-Gurion were strengthened by the aforementioned more recent volume, Israeli scholar, Avner Cohen's 1998 book *Israel and the Bomb*, which created quite a sensation in Israel.

The "nuclear option" was not only at the very core of Ben-Gurion's personal worldview, but the very foundation of Israel's national security policy. The Israelis were essentially willing, if necessary, to "blow up the world"—including themselves—if they had to do so in order to defeat their Arab foes in the event Israel was about to fall.

This is what Hersh notes Israeli nuclear planners considered "the Samson Option"—that, as Samson of the Bible, after being captured by the Philistines, brought down Dagon's Temple in Gaza and killed himself along with his enemies.

As Hersh put it: "For Israel's nuclear advocates, the Samson Option became another way of saying 'Never again,' (in reference to preventing another Holocaust).

All of the evidence, taken together in the big picture, clearly demonstrates that it was indeed "the Samson Option" that was indeed the primary cause of Ben-Gurion's resignation.

The bottom line is that—in 1963—JFK's conflict with Ben-Gurion was a secret to both the Israeli public and the American public and remained so for more than 20 years at least and still largely remains so, despite the release of Hersh's book, followed by *Final Judgment* and then the book by Avner Cohen.

Cohen's powerful book confirmed everything Hersh had written but went even further.

Cohen described how the conflict between JFK and Ben-Gurion reached its peak in 1963 and how, on June 16 of that year, JFK sent a letter to the Israeli leader that Cohen says was "the toughest and most explicit message" yet, adding that: "Kennedy exerted the most useful leverage available to an American president in dealing with Israel: a threat that an unsatisfactory solution would jeopardize the U.S. government's commitment to, and support of, Israel"

Ben-Gurion never read JFK's letter. Instead, Ben-Gurion announced his resignation. Cohen said that Ben-Gurion never provided an explanation for his decision, except in reference to "personal reasons." To his cabinet colleagues Ben-Gurion said that he "must" resign and that "no

state problem or event caused it." Cohen added that Ben-Gurion had "concluded that he could not tell the truth about Dimona to American leaders, not even in private."

Immediately upon Ben-Gurion's resignation, JFK wrote a letter to the new prime minister. Levi Eshkol, that was evidently even more fierce than JFK's previous communications with Ben-Gurion. Cohen wrote:

Not since Eisenhower's message to Ben-Gurion in the midst of the Suez crisis in November 1956 had an American president been so blunt with an Israeli prime minister.

Kennedy told Eshkol that the U.S. commitment and support of Israel "could be seriously jeopardized" if Israel did not let the United States obtain "reliable information" about its efforts in the nuclear field.

Kennedy's demands were unprecedented. They amounted, in effect, to an ultimatum.

Cohen noted that: "From [Eshkol's] perspective, Kennedy's demands seemed diplomatically inappropriate; they were inconsistent with national sovereignty. There was no legal basis or political precedent for such demands," Cohen says "Kennedy's letter precipitated a near-crisis situation in the prime minister's office."

So, contrary to what some might suggest today, Kennedy's pressure on Israel did not end with the resignation of Ben-Gurion.

Instead, JFK's pressure on Israel over its nuclear ambitions clearly intensified. JFK would have no part of a nuclear-armed Israel in any way, shape or form.

The Israeli newspaper, *Ha'aretz*, published a review of Cohen's book on February 5, 1999, calling it "a bombshell of a book." The *Ha'aretz* review, by Reuven Pedatzur, is quite interesting. It reads in part:

The murder of American President John F Kennedy brought to an abrupt end the massive pressure being applied by the U.S. administration on the government of Israel to discontinue the nuclear program. Cohen demonstrates at length the pressures applied by Kennedy on Ben-Gurion.

He brings the fascinating exchange of letters between the two, in which Kennedy makes it quite clear to [Ben-Gurion] that he [JFK] will under no circumstances agree to Israel becoming a nuclear state.

The book implied that, had Kennedy remained alive, it is doubtful whether Israel would today have a nuclear option.

The words of historian Stephen Green summarize it all too well:

Perhaps the most significant development of 1963 for the Israeli nuclear weapons program, however, occurred on November 22 on a plane flying from Dallas to Washington, D.C., Lyndon Johnson was sworn in as the 36th President of the United States, following the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

Green elaborated further, in these stark terms:

In the early years of the Johnson administration the Israeli nuclear weapons program was referred to in Washington as 'the delicate topic.' Lyndon Johnson's White House saw no Dimona, heard no Dimona, and spoke no Dimona when the reactor went critical in early 1964.

Thus, the critical point of dispute between John F. Kennedy and the Mossad-dominated government of Israel was no longer an issue. The new American president—so long a partisan of Israel—allowed the nuclear program to continue. This was just the beginning.

How does the more "conventional" thesis that the CIA was the prime mover behind the JFK assassination fit alongside the theory that the Mossad was also a key force in the JFK conspiracy?

By 1963 John F. Kennedy was not only at war with Israel and the crime syndicate dominated by Israeli loyalist Meyer Lansky and his Mafia henchmen, but JFK was also at war with their close ally in the international intelligence underworld—the CIA.

The CIA, of course, had its own problems with JFK. Just six weeks before John F. Kennedy was shot, *The New York Times* itself reported that a top Kennedy administration official had warned that a CIA-orchestrated coup in America was a fearful possibility.

Like its allies in Israel, forces within the CIA had good reason (in their own view) to want to see JFK removed from the White House and replaced with Lyndon B. Johnson.

JFK's battle with the CIA over the Bay of Pigs debacle was just the beginning. JFK was—by the last days of his presidency—not only fighting the CIA's efforts to involve the United States ever more deeply in Southeast Asia, but he was also moving toward dismantling the CIA entirely. The CIA's very existence was in danger.

This, of course, has brought focus on the CIA as a likely suspect in the assassination and it was the course of investigation followed by Jim Garrison (who, as noted, later came to suspect Mossad involvement).

However, there are other often-mentioned CIA connections to the assassination that also point toward the Mossad.

For example, we now do know that one well-known American often linked to the assassination—and who reportedly confessed to actual involvement in the JFK assassination—did have multiple longtime links to the Mossad for many years prior to (and after) the JFK assassination.

There's much more to that story in and of itself and, in the chapters which follow, we'll examine that little-known revelation further.

And we'll find that the circles of intrigue in Miami, New Orleans and Dallas that were central to the conspiracy surrounding the assassination of President Kennedy were linked—through multiple individuals at multiple levels—to Israel and its Mossad.

But, for the moment, let us close with this:

Some years ago, an American gentleman met famed CBS newsman Walter Cronkite at Martha's Vineyard. He apprised Cronkite of the theory of Mossad involvement in the JFK assassination and Cronkite listened carefully. Cronkite's response was intriguing, to say the least.

Looking out to sea, Cronkite remarked quite succinctly: "I can't think of any group—with the exception of Israeli intelligence—that would have been able to keep the JFK assassination conspiracy under wraps for so long."

The evidence demonstrates that there is a very strong foundation for the thesis of Mossad involvement in the JFK assassination conspiracy. It is a scenario that does make sense, much to the dismay of many critics. The scenario comes closer than anything yet written in summarizing *the entirety* of the JFK assassination conspiracy.

This "unusual" and certainly controversial reconstruction of the JFK assassination conspiracy takes a new look at a very big jigsaw puzzle.

On the front of the puzzle are all of the various groups and individuals often named as suspects in the JFK assassination conspiracy—a remarkably complex and rather murky picture.

However, when one turns the puzzle over, there is a large and very clear image of the Israeli flag to be found.

In the pages which follow we will explore the Israeli connection further, demonstrating that Lee Harvey Oswald was indeed a "false flag." But, more importantly, we will examine the actual over-riding template for terror that was utilized by the Mossad in orchestrating the JFK assassination—the same template later used in the Oklahoma City bombing and in the 9-11 terrorist attacks.

CHAPTER FOUR:

The Big Picture of “Big D”: The Myth of Dallas and the “Right Wing” False Flag in the JFK Conspiracy

One of the most persistent—even legendary—“false flags” perpetuated in the lore of the JFK assassination conspiracy focuses on the theme that “right wing extremists” played a major hand in the assassination of the president. Many of the more naive among the JFK assassination researchers who fancy themselves to be “liberals” have helped promote this theory, playing into the hands of the real sources responsible for the assassination.

Dallas—they have solemnly advised us—was chosen as the site of the assassination because it was a “hotbed” of right-wing extremism and the ideal place to carry off the crime and cover it up.

Supposedly ruled by the colorful “right wing” oilman H. L. Hunt and a coterie of like-minded Kennedy-hating White Anglo-Saxon Protestant petroleum plutocrats—Jew-haters and racists of the worst sort—the prevalence of John Birchers and Ku Klux Klansmen and other so-called “super patriots” in the ranks of the police and law enforcement made Dallas the perfect spot for the dirty deed. And with Jack Ruby—a “Mafia” henchman—paying off the Dallas cops, the conspiracy to kill the president was sure to succeed. And did.

Or so the story goes.

It is a story—a myth—that continues to rear its foolish head in much of the literature on the JFK assassination and adds further to the confusion and misunderstanding about what really happened in Dallas and why—and, for that matter, *how*.

In the end, it is perhaps the “how” that is of significant special interest. And by the “how” we do not mean the weapons used, the number of assassins involved, the type of bullets employed, etc—the very subjects that have bedeviled JFK researchers for years, distracting from the important ultimate question of WHO killed the American president.

Instead, by the “how” we refer to the behind-the-scenes machinations in Dallas—by organized Jewish forces (tied to Israel and the Jewish crime syndicate)—that expedited the murder of the president and the cover-up that followed, a cover-up that quite specifically included the murder of the chosen patsy, Lee Harvey Oswald.

The fact that Jewish-controlled Hollywood played a considerable part—even more so—in instilling the image of Dallas in the public mind as a violent cowboy town full of conniving wheeler dealers epitomized by J. R. Ewing, the iconic villain-in-chief on “Dallas”—the popular long-

running CBS night-time soap opera—effectively waved the “right wing” false flag ever higher than before, this time via the magic of television.

In retrospect, is it really just a coincidence that the CBS drama immortalized that memorable question (that burning issue) that riveted America (if not the entire civilized world): “Who shot J.R.?” playing on that other query so long linked to Dallas: “Who shot JFK?”

In fact, I must confess, when I began my own inquiry into the question of “Who shot JFK?” I paid very little attention to the events in Dallas, looking instead, I thought, at the “big picture.”

And while I was indeed looking at the big picture (and quite correctly), I never realized—until much later—that even in Dallas could be found evidence pointing toward Israeli involvement in the JFK affair.

It was only several years after *Final Judgment* had been first published that I received a communication from one critical reader who outlined, in quite extensive—and for me, rather embarrassing—detail how I had missed many important facts about people and events in Dallas which did implicate a pivotal Jewish role in the events that took place in Dallas before, during and after the assassination.

What makes all of this the more ironic—for me, personally—is that while many of my critics had contended that in *Final Judgment* I had looked under every rock and behind every door (or behind every bush on the grassy knoll, so to speak) trying to find a Jew (or a Jewish or Israeli connection to the assassination), the truth is that I had failed (and miserably I might add) in failing to look right there in Dallas where, I soon found out, there were far many more Jewish and Israeli links than I might have ever imagined.

For—you see—I, too, had been taken in by what we might call “The Myth of Dallas,” and believed the old legend (the false flag) about Dallas being a right-wing enclave of fanatic JFK haters carrying copies of *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* under one arm and *The Blue Book* of the John Birch Society under the other.

In 2005—as the second printing of the sixth edition of *Final Judgment* was being readied for press—a comprehensive, fact-filled 19-page single-spaced, type-written, anonymously-authored document, cited with 115 footnotes, relying on a wide variety of mainstream sources, arrived in my mailbox in an envelope (with no return address) postmarked “Dallas, Texas.”

Entitled “The Kennedy Assassination and Israel: Some Dallas Connections,” the document—in my judgment the work of a professional journalist—focused on “the specifics of how the Israelis could have influenced the events in Dallas,” filling in details never explored in previous editions of *Final Judgment*.

The data is quite explosive, particularly when contrasted with the mythology regarding "Big D" repeated ad infinitum in JFK literature. However, understanding *the real Dallas*—not the city of legend and of Hollywood drama—helps one understand how false flags have indeed repeatedly been used to cover up the origins of the JFK assassination conspiracy. And the document helps us understand the template for terror that was utilized in sending President Kennedy to his grave.

What follows is a sharply-abbreviated summary of the carefully-referenced and wide-ranging data in the remarkable assembly of material that I received.

First of all, the document buries the tired old myth that a clique of anti-Semitic White Anglo-Saxon Protestant oil barons ruled Dallas. Instead, the truth is quite the opposite.

Not only did Dallas have an immensely powerful Jewish community, but, more importantly, the city (and Texas) had been a major center of fundraising and arms smuggling on behalf of the Zionist cause, going back to the 1940s. Even Jonathan Pollard, the American spy for Israel, said he was inspired to pro-Israel activism by stories he heard (while living in Texas) of gunrunning for the Israeli underground by Jews in Texas.

In fact, the official published history of a major Zionist arms smuggling operation, the Sonneborn Institute, reports that its agents smuggled aircraft parts out of Texas to Israel.

This was happening—when Sonneborn's activities were at a zenith—just at the time when a then-recently-discharged Army Air Corps aircraft mechanic, Jack Ruby, was re-settling in Dallas in 1947, the year prior to Israel's birth.

In fact, we now know—from de-classified FBI files—that Ruby bragged of having run arms to Israel and, in 1963, is known to have been part of an arms smuggling operation in Texas and Louisiana (and their environs) overseen by an Israeli intelligence officer, a point brought to light by Dr. William Pepper in his book, *An Act of State*.

Pepper's book, focusing on the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, reports that Ruby—along with the mysterious "Raul" who later manipulated Dr. King's alleged assassin, James Earl Ray—was part of an operation that was stealing weapons and other supplies from U.S. military arsenals and then, in turn, smuggling them to Israel.

And this, of course, ties back to the point made earlier (see page xx) that famed JFK assassination researcher Penn Jones had, on his own, made a connection between Ruby and Israeli intelligence, a point that virtually all other JFK researchers have preferred to avoid.

So there was an intimate Israeli connection to Texas that most people never realized existed—even including up until today.

All of this having been said, it is critical to recognize how JFK was lured to Dallas and who was in charge of the arrangements that actually facilitated his assassination.

This again, quite distinctly, points in the direction of Israel and its loyalists in Texas.

Although JFK's overall Texas trip (involving stops in a number of cities) was certainly aimed at building up support for his 1964 reelection campaign, JFK's primary interest in going to Dallas itself was for fund-raising purposes.

And this is where things get interesting.

While those JFK researchers (who promote the theme of a Dallas-linked "right wing" conspiracy) focus on conservative Republican opposition to JFK in Dallas, the truth is that the power elite in "Big D" were not Republicans, but, rather, Democrats and it was from these sources JFK was obliged to seek financial and political support.

And the historical record shows that the Dallas power elite (and the financial backbone of the city's Democratic Party) were centered in a powerful business group known as the Citizens Council (CC). It was the CC that actually sponsored the Dallas leg of JFK's trip. However, contrary to the legend of Dallas, it was not a clique of racist WASP oil tycoons who ruled the city through the CC. Rather, in fact, two of the three key figures who dominated the CC were Jewish.

These were the folks who *really* ran Dallas, not conservatives affiliated with the John Birch Society, as the popular old myth suggests.

Many JFK researchers, perhaps out of ignorance, confuse the CC of Dallas with the Citizens' Councils across the South which were, at that time, fighting racial integration. But the CC of Dallas had no connection with the anti-integrationist forces.

(Although, however—again contrary to legend—Jews and Jewish business elites across the South were not as friendly to the civil rights movement of the 1960s as modern-day Jewish-sponsored accounts of the period would have us believe.)

In 1963, one of the key Jewish power brokers on the CC was an outspokenly pro-Israel liquor wholesaler, Julius Schepps, who held the distribution rights in Dallas for the products of the Seagram's company, the fiefdom of the Bronfman family of Canada, the first family of the World Jewish Congress, primary patrons of Israel, and longtime top-level figures allied with Meyer Lansky in the Jewish crime syndicate.

In addition, the Bronfman family were "Texas oil barons" themselves—having bought control of Texas Pacific Oil in 1963.

And—as I had already pointed out in *Final Judgment*—there is evidence Jack Ruby himself was actually on the Bronfman payroll, no sur-

prise considering the fact that Bronfman fingerprints are to be found all over the JFK assassination conspiracy, including, of course, the family's link to the Permindex group (described earlier on pages 46-52).

And this is a point that many of those who point to Ruby's actually-quite-tenuous alleged "Mafia" connections prefer to avoid, harkening instead to that other popular false flag: that "The Mafia Killed JFK."

(Even if—as the legend goes—Jack Ruby was Al Capone's "wheelman" in Chicago at some point in his career, the truth is, as I documented carefully in my book *The New Babylon*, Capone was himself hardly more than a highly-paid—although widely-known—front man for the Bronfmans and the Lansky syndicate, another point the advocates of the theory that "The Mafia Killed JFK" find difficult to acknowledge.)

In any event, the means by which the Jewish-dominated Dallas elite gained control of JFK's Dallas trip agenda is interesting—and it ties directly to no less than Jack Ruby.

Since JFK's Dallas trip was officially designated as "non political"—in contrast to other Texas stops such as Houston and Austin which were designated as "political"—the private entities paying for the Dallas trip gained control of the planning (thus taking it out of the hands of the JFK-controlled Democratic National Committee).

As such, the CC designated a "host committee." The chairman was Dallas Jewish leader and public relations man, Sam Bloom, the CC's long-time executive director who—it just so happens—attended the same Dallas synagogue as Jack Ruby.

(And when the police searched Ruby's home after he infamously shot the alleged assassin, Mr. Oswald, they found a slip of paper with Bloom's name, address and telephone number on it.)

In retrospect, it seems, Sam Bloom is one of the least known—but most pivotal—figures in world history.

The record shows that there was an immediate confrontation between Bloom—representing the Dallas elite—and Jerry Bruno, JFK's veteran advance man, over the arrangements for the Dallas visit. Bruno wanted the president to speak at the Women's Building, but the rulers of Dallas insisted JFK speak at the Trade Mart.

Although Bruno fought long and hard, the Dallas elite prevailed after much pressure, causing the JFK loyalist to comment that "this was one of the few fights like this that I had lost. On things like this my judgment was usually taken. This time it wasn't."

By forcing JFK to speak at the Trade Mart, the Dallas elite positioned the JFK motorcade to take the now-infamous "dog-leg" turn into what was a classically sniper-friendly "kill zone" just below the Texas School Book Depository (TSBD), from where it was later claimed the alleged

assassin, TSBD employee Lee Harvey Oswald, fired the fatal shots. The spot was also in easy range of the "grassy knoll" and the nearby Dal-Tex Building, where researchers also believe snipers were located.

Had JFK's advance man prevailed—as he usually did—JFK (on his way to Bruno's preferred location) would have traveled two blocks farther away from the TSBD—out of the kill zone—at a greater speed.

Although the Secret Service objected (for security reasons) to the publication of JFK's motorcade route, Bloom—the point man for the Dallas Jewish elite—nonetheless made sure a map of the route was repeatedly published in Dallas papers. Thus, later, when the "patsy" was in custody, there was a plausible explanation as to how he knew in advance that JFK would pass his workplace.

That an assassin quite probably fired on JFK from the Dal-Tex Building is most relevant in the context of an Israeli connection. Co-owned by David Weisblat, a major financial backer of the Israeli lobby's Anti-Defamation League, Dal-Tex housed, on different floors, a number of firms utilizing the telephone number of Morty Freedman, an attorney, garment manufacturer, and activist in Jewish affairs.

Since JFK was working to stop Israel's nuclear arms program—which received smuggled uranium from U.S. sources—it is notable that one Dal-Tex firm linked to Freedman was the Dallas Uranium & Oil Company. It is also intriguing that one of Freedman's Dal-Tex business partners was Abe Zapruder, the Jewish dress manufacturer who filmed the assassination and profited immensely. Today there are some who now believe Zapruder had advance knowledge of the assassination.

Once the accused assassin was in custody, it was Sam Bloom—who had maneuvered JFK into the kill zone—who pressured Elgin Crull, the city manager, to in turn pressure Dallas Police Chief Jesse Curry into making Oswald accessible to the press and to move him publicly from the Dallas police station to the city jail. Several sources, including Dallas FBI agent James Hosty, said Bloom and his backers were the forces behind this. These maneuvers thus made Oswald an easy target and made it possible for Jack Ruby to move in for the kill.

As far as Ruby's killing of Oswald, there is—although JFK assassination researchers prefer to avoid it—yet another "Israeli connection." It is well known—though not widely discussed—that at the time Ruby was apparently stalking Oswald, milling about the Dallas Police Department after the assassination, Ruby told at least one person that he was there for the purpose of translating for Israeli "reporters" on the scene.

Dare I suggest that it seems highly unlikely Israeli correspondents in the United States would have English capabilities so lacking that they required the translation services of a Dallas strip club operator?

So while Ruby's association with these Israeli reporters may have been completely innocent, what is interesting is that neither the Warren Commission nor any enterprising JFK researchers have ever tracked down these reporters. In fact, at one conference of JFK researchers one attendee created a bit of a stir when he asked if anyone had ever determined precisely which Israeli newspapers Jack Ruby was translating for and whether anyone ever interviewed those reporters to find out what Ruby may have said to them in those critical hours.

In any case, we do know that there were Israelis in Dallas on the day of the assassination, including Mossad figure and future Israeli prime minister Yitzhak Rabin, then a high-ranking military officer, purportedly on a "military briefing tour," according to Rabin's widow. Two weeks later Rabin was promoted to chief of staff of the Israeli Defense Forces.

This proves nothing (perhaps) but is a detail for the record.

And one more item, worthy of note. Following the assassination, we find another intimate Bronfman connection in the inner circles of the investigation. Brought in by the authorities as a translator for Lee Oswald's Russian-born wife, Marina, was Jack Crichton.

Recalled largely by JFK researchers as yet another of the ubiquitous "oil men," to be found in the so-called "right wing" conspiracy behind the JFK assassination, Crichton, in fact, was also vice president of the Empire Trust. And even respected JFK researcher Dick Russell has noted that the Empire Trust was controlled by the Bronfman family, along with other eminent New York "Our Crowd" elite Jewish elite families such as the Loeb's and the Lehman's.

Clearly, there was very much a distinct Jewish—and even Israeli—connection to the events in Dallas, one that I had initially missed in my own research (and which virtually all JFK researchers ignore).

And so it is that the Dallas myth comes to an end—a painful reality for those who thought the city an anti-Jewish stronghold, ripe for Nazi revolution. Instead, Dallas was actually an outpost for the advancement of the interests of Israel.

Although Walt Brown suggested in *Treachery in Dallas* that the city's elite were prime movers behind the assassination, he rushed to write elsewhere that the JFK assassination "wasn't done by Mossad . . . as some would have us believe" (referring to *Final Judgment*).

However, in light of the "Big Picture of Big D"—details Brown ignored (or suppressed) in terms of their ultimate (and critical) context—it's time for *genuine* JFK assassination truth seekers to take a new look at the real forces behind the JFK assassination and to disregard (or rather, more correctly come to recognize and understand) all of the false flags that have been thrown up in their faces time and again.

CHAPTER FIVE:

The Man in the Middle: E. Howard Hunt and the JFK Assassination

There's very good reason to believe that the late infamous longtime CIA officer E. Howard Hunt had a great deal of inside knowledge about the assassination of President John F. Kennedy—*but not for the reasons you might think.*

And for those readers who, at this juncture, think they “know” the story of Hunt's involvement in the assassination—based on variety of information (and deliberate disinformation) that has been circulating now for nearly 50 years—we ask your patience and indulgence, for the assessment—or, should we say, re-assessment—of Hunt's link to the events in Dallas that we are about to examine is perhaps even more fascinating and revealing than you might expect.

The Hunt “connection” to the JFK assassination is very real, but it involves a tangled web of intrigue that, in the end, points in multiple directions at multiple levels to the ultimate forces behind the president's murder: Israel and its intelligence service, the Mossad.

To understand Hunt's link to Dallas—and subsequent public revelations relating thereto—it is first quite necessary to examine the origins of the long-standing suspicions that Hunt was involved in some way in the JFK assassination conspiracy. The series of events and the wide-ranging number of players involved is complex, but it is vital that these details be understood by anyone with a serious interest in unraveling the real nature of the false flags and the template for terror that was utilized in the assassination of President Kennedy.

All of that having been said, let it be noted right up front that Hunt was not—repeat NOT—one of the famous “three tramps” photographed in Dealey Plaza in the aftermath of the president's murder. Nor, for that matter, was Frank Sturgis—Hunt's colleague in CIA-sponsored anti-Castro activities involving Cuban exiles—another of the tramps.

But this has been a story that has taken on a life of its own, a popular legend that first began popping up in the super-market tabloids in the mid-1970s in the wake of the Watergate scandal that entangled Hunt and Sturgis and first brought them widespread international public attention. And all of this took place at the very time the House of Representatives was launching a new inquiry into the JFK assassination (as well as the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King).

There was even another picture, published in one of the tabloids, that purports to show “Hunt” picking up a bullet in Dealey Plaza immediately after the assassination.

If anything the individual who is supposed to be Hunt looks more like former President Gerald Ford who served on the Warren Commission and the gentleman in Dealey Plaza, it should be noted for the record, was most definitely not Ford.

In any case, the story that Hunt—along with Frank Sturgis—was one of the three tramps received its most significant boost with the publication in 1975 of the book *Coup d'etat in America: The CIA and the Assassination of John F. Kennedy* by A. J. Weberman and Michael Canfield—a book which, I might mention, grabbed my attention at the time and which did, indeed, cause quite a stir.

The book convinced many people that Hunt and Sturgis were two of the “tramps” and added a great deal of fuel to the growing fire of belief that the CIA had (as many long suspected) played a part in the assassination of the president, a theory that certainly deserved consideration, considering JFK’s well-known conflict with the CIA.

However, in the years that have passed, many independent JFK assassination investigators have looked into the story of the three tramps and concluded that the individuals in the controversial series of photographs were indeed tramps—not assassins or conspirators.

And while there are still a number of JFK researchers who continue to quibble, in one form or another, over the actual identity of the tramps, the one thing that can be said for certain is that neither Hunt nor Sturgis were among them.

Nonetheless, the Hunt-Sturgis “tramp” story continues to fester and to this day there are many people who confuse other information linking Hunt and/or Sturgis to the assassination with the story of the tramps when, in fact, not even all of those who have linked Hunt and Sturgis to the assassination are necessarily contending that the duo were among the three tramps.

It should be mentioned, however, that there are a handful of folks who do continue to insist that Hunt and Sturgis were among the three tramps—the considerable evidence to the contrary notwithstanding.

As a consequence, all of this adds further to the general and continuing confusion surrounding Hunt (and Sturgis) in relation to what appears to be their very real link to the assassination which we will be exploring in the pages which follow.

Now it is important to note that the Weberman-Canfield book appeared precisely at the time when a famous “Dear Mr. Hunt” letter—in what seemed to be Lee Harvey Oswald’s hand-writing—emerged (purportedly out of Mexico) and the appearance of this letter gave further suspicion to the possibility of that Hunt was connected to Oswald and the JFK assassination.

Although, of course, there were others who claimed that the purported Oswald letter was more likely addressed to Texas oil baron H. L. Hunt who, over the years, had also been touted as a possible conspirator in the president's assassination, part of the theory that "right wing extremists" had been behind the president's death, this theory holds less water in light of a number of factors that we are about to explore.

In fact, there is a variety of evidence—coming from different sources—which does suggest that at least some of the stories linking Hunt to the JFK assassination (while having *some basis in truth*) were, in the end, a form of "black propaganda" designed to confuse even further the already complex web of debate surrounding the assassination and Hunt's involvement therein.

In recent years, CIA-connected British writer Christopher Andrew asserted that the "Dear Mr. Hunt" letter was a forgery originating with the Soviet KGB as part of an attempt to link the CIA to the assassination. However, as I have noted in some detail in *Final Judgment*—and others have noted quite extensively elsewhere—Andrew is not a source that can be readily believed. And that's putting it lightly.

Needless to say, whether the "Dear Mr. Hunt" letter was really written by Lee Harvey Oswald (or whether it was just a forgery), there is good reason to believe that the release of the letter was actually part of a carefully coordinated conspiracy at the highest levels of the CIA to muddy the research and inquiry into the JFK assassination further.

And in *Final Judgment* I have asserted flat out my opinion—and that's all it is, an opinion—that the release of the letter was orchestrated by the Mossad's ally at the CIA, James Jesus Angleton, whom—we have already seen—was most definitely a key player in the assassination of President Kennedy, playing a central role in the framing of Lee Harvey Oswald as the "pro-Castro" patsy he is painted in the official versions of history that have been perpetrated as part of the cover-up.

The truth is that at the time the letter popped up, Angleton was responsible (and there's no question about this) for deliberately leaking other information that was designed to "link" E. Howard Hunt to the JFK assassination conspiracy. And we will be discussing that shortly.

In the meantime, though, it should probably be noted that there is the outside possibility that even the Weberman-Canfield book (which gave a great boost to the "Hunt as tramp" legend) was actually part of the Angleton operation just mentioned. We find a distinct "Israeli connection" in the circumstances surrounding the book.

As recently as December 28, 2012, *Forward*—a respected Jewish newspaper based in Manhattan—reported that Weberman (who is Jewish) is "a close associate of Jewish Defense Organization founder

Mordechai Levy, whose fringe group is a spin-off of the late Rabbi Meir Kahane's militant right-wing Jewish Defense League."

Forward did not mention that Weberman's associate Levy—whose relationship with Weberman I had noted in *Final Judgment*—was also known to have been an undercover informant for the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith—a longtime adjunct of Israel's Mossad.

However, *Forward* also unveiled a most revealing point of which I had not been aware: The fact that A. J. Weberman had "immigrated to Israel in 1959 and has dual American-Israeli citizenship"

For his own part, in the pages of his own book, Weberman revealed that the Capitol Hill power broker who played an early instrumental role facilitating Weberman's effort to promote the "Hunt as tramp" theory was Richard Perle, a longtime Mossad asset who is today a very well known front-line player in the "neo-conservative" pro-Israel network.

Misspelling his name as "Pearl," Weberman only casually mentioned Perle's support for his efforts at a time (back in 1975) before Perle came to have the negative public recognition he has today, long before Perle's intimate connections to Israeli intelligence were so widely recognized.

That Perle—then a key figure on Capitol Hill working for Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.), one of Israel's leading advocates in Congress—actually lent his good offices to promoting the Weberman-Canfield thesis is significant indeed does raise some very real questions as to the origins of the thesis, a matter we'll be reviewing in even further detail.

In addition, the Nigerian who published the Weberman-Canfield book in the United States was also the publisher in Africa of the writings of David Ben-Gurion, the Israeli leader who had been engaged in the secret bitter conflict with JFK over Israel's nuclear weapons ambitions.

And last but far from least, consider this: Weberman admitted in the updated edition of *Coup D'Etat in America* that "when I did my research in D.C., I stayed at my friend John Foster Berlet's apartment."

Weberman's admission here—alone—raises questions about the nature of Weberman's associations if nothing else does. The aforementioned Berlet—who uses the name "Chip" Berlet professionally—is a controversial figure, to say the least.

Multiple voices—ranging from respected progressives such as Daniel Brandt to the late Ace Hayes, firebrand publisher of *The Portland Free Press* to Jane Hunter, a prominent Jewish critic of Israel, and many others—have been critical of Berlet's ties to the Israeli lobby's Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and—note this—have raised questions about Berlet's ties to the intelligence community. The July-August 1995 issue of *The Portland Free Press* featured a devastating analysis of Berlet entitled "Berlet for Beginners," discussing all of this and more.

Berlet denies, as many have charged, that he has been an intelligence asset operating inside “liberal” causes since the 1970s, going back to his days with the National Student Association, which was exposed to have been covertly financed and influenced by the CIA for its own insidious purposes. Berlet also insists it’s only a rumor he was named by his father—a military man and Wall Street financier with deep ties to the intelligence community—after former Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, brother of Allen Dulles, the CIA director fired by JFK.

It’s also probably worth noting that Berlet’s mentor, David Ifshin—who actually recruited Berlet into the National Student Association—was later general counsel and member of the executive committee of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee and active in the Anti-Defamation League and the American Jewish Committee. I

Ifshin was also a key player in the Coalition for a Democratic Majority, another of the pro-Israel lobbying forces, which was a major player behind the presidential ambitions of the aforementioned Sen. Henry Jackson whose then-assistant, Richard Perle, was so helpful to Berlet’s friend Weberman in making his way around Capitol Hill.

Now, all of these details don’t “prove” anything, *per se*, but they do cast a new perspective on Weberman and his book and its origins, particularly in light of the fact that the Mossad’s devoted ally at the CIA, James J. Angleton, was involved in stoking up suspicions about Hunt’s links to the events in Dallas at precisely the same time the book emerged—the circumstances of which we will explore in a moment.

In the meantime, in the wake of the release of the Weberman-Canfield book, the House Select Committee on Assassinations was convened in 1976 to reinvestigate the murders of JFK and Dr. Martin Luther King and over the next several years, conducted widely-publicized hearings that resulted in a “final”—if relatively inconclusive—report in 1979 suggesting that Lee Harvey Oswald had been part of a “Mafia” conspiracy to kill the president.

However, during that same time frame, other events were taking place which set the stage for further revelations relating to the behind-the-scenes intrigues of James J. Angleton—the Mossad’s man at the CIA—in relation to the JFK assassination and its cover-up.

And central to those revelations was the ever-controversial CIA man E. Howard Hunt who—perhaps unwittingly—helped us come to understand the nature and origins (and manner) of the conspiracy that resulted in the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

It was not until the release in 1991 of Mark Lane’s best-selling book, *Plausible Denial*, that the extent of the CIA’s involvement in the JFK assassination was fully outlined. Suspicion of the CIA’s complicity had

been growing over the years, but, in the minds of most observers, Lane's book proved the matter once and for all.

While primarily a written summation of a libel trial in Miami in 1985 in which the jury had concluded that the CIA had indeed been involved in the JFK assassination conspiracy and cover-up, Lane's book was also a wide-ranging reflection by Lane on his own singular role as one of the earliest and most effective critics of the Warren Commission.

The circumstances of how the trial came about are interesting. It was on August 14, 1978, that the Washington-based weekly newspaper, *The Spotlight*, published an article by former high-ranking CIA official Victor Marchetti, then best-known as the author of the controversial 1973 best-seller, *The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence*, which was the first book ever censored prior to publication by the CIA.

In essence, Marchetti's article for *The Spotlight* alleged the CIA intended to frame or otherwise implicate E. Howard Hunt with involvement in the Kennedy assassination.

The article suggested there was then so much growing suspicion the CIA had been involved in the JFK assassination that the CIA had decided to sacrifice Hunt and say that Hunt was a "renegade" operative involved in the president's assassination, that the CIA as an institution had not been part of the conspiracy.

The article, of course, came in the contentious years following the Watergate scandal in which Hunt had been a major player, and in the wake of the highly-publicized Senate hearings of 1975 in which the CIA came under focus for its involvement in a variety of misdeeds, ranging from foreign assassination plots to bizarre mind control experiments to illegal activities on American soil.

And while subsequent media commentary suggested *The Spotlight* article was based on the theory that Hunt was one of the famous "tramps" (discussed earlier) that was never, in any way, a foundation of the article by Marchetti.

Although the editors of *The Spotlight* felt Marchetti's article served, if anything, as an advance warning to Hunt about what his former employers had in mind, the ex-CIA man decided to sue *The Spotlight*, even though Hunt himself initially admitted under oath in the earliest stages of his libel suit that he believed that Marchetti's story had a basis in truth—that it was plausible, that his former colleagues in the CIA did indeed consider framing him for involvement in the JFK assassination.

Now what is particularly interesting, in light of Hunt's lawsuit against *The Spotlight*, is that Hunt did *not* bring suit against another newspaper, the Wilmington, Delaware-based *Sunday News Journal* that, on August 20, 1978, had published an article remarkably similar in most

respects to the article that had just been published in *The Spotlight*.^{*} We'll come back to that second article shortly.

But for the present, we'll take a look at Marchetti's article, which was most intriguing, by any estimation.

The origin of the memorandum linking Hunt to the JFK assassination, as outlined by Marchetti, is especially interesting. He described the memorandum as one that "the agency just happened to stumble across in its old files."

In other words, one might presume from Marchetti's flippant reference, the CIA had, instead, perhaps concocted the memo.

That the agency "just happened to stumble across" the memo at a time when suspicion of CIA involvement in the assassination was growing is, of course, interesting, to say the least.

Had Hunt been in Dallas the day JFK was killed, it would look suspicious. His intimate involvement with the anti-Castro Cubans would have made Hunt "a likely suspect," and as Marchetti pointed out, linking the controversial Hunt to the assassination would be a cover story the public would easily accept.

The CIA, as an institution, would absolve itself of any responsibility, having thrown Hunt to the wolves, calling him as a "rogue" operator out of the CIA's control. The CIA could lay claim to having "solved" the JFK assassination at last. An additional benefit: Hunt's alleged involvement would also draw in a number of other false flags—not only the anti-Castro Cubans, but also "right wing" critics of JFK in general.

^{*} Because *The Spotlight* was "controversial"—often accused of "anti-Semitism," and attacked for its stand against the influence of the Israeli lobby—the populist newspaper, quite naturally, was viewed by Hunt and his attorneys as an easy target and this is basic explanation as to why that newspaper was targeted whereas the Wilmington *Sunday News Journal* was not.

But there was also another factor at work. At the very time Hunt moved against *The Spotlight*, Hunt's longtime close friend, William F. Buckley, Jr.—owner/editor of the conservative journal, *National Review*—was himself engaged in a contentious, long-standing war of words with the publisher of *The Spotlight* going back nearly a decade. It was subsequently revealed that Buckley—who had served under Hunt in the CIA in Mexico in the 1950s and who was the godfather of one of Hunt's children—had actually provided Hunt the financial resources to pursue his libel suit against *The Spotlight*.

Buckley himself ultimately brought his own libel suit against *The Spotlight* and in 1985—not long after the Hunt case came to a close—Buckley and his attorneys were dealt a devastating courtroom defeat by no less than Mark Lane, the attorney and JFK assassination investigator who had spearheaded *The Spotlight's* defense against Hunt.

Now, in the meantime, as mentioned earlier, another article linking Hunt to Dallas had been published in the Wilmington, Delaware *Sunday News Journal*, hardly even a week after *The Spotlight* had published the article by Marchetti.

Based on the same fact situation—the sudden appearance of a CIA memo placing Hunt in Dallas—the article by Joe Trento and Jacquie Powers—was somewhat different from Marchetti's article, but the similarities were most significant. The Trento-Powers article read in part:

WASHINGTON—A secret CIA memorandum says that E. Howard Hunt was in Dallas the day President John F. Kennedy was murdered and that top agency officials plotted to cover up Hunt's presence there.

Some CIA sources speculate Hunt thought he was assigned by higher-ups to arrange the murder of Lee Harvey Oswald.

Sources say Hunt . . . was acting chief of the CIA station in Mexico City in the weeks prior to the Kennedy assassination. Oswald was in Mexico City, and met with two Soviet KGB agents at the Russian Embassy there immediately before leaving for Dallas, according to the official Warren Commission report.

The 1966 secret memo, now in the hands of the House assassination committee, places Hunt in Dallas Nov. 22, 1963.

Richard M. Helms, former CIA director, and James J. Angleton, former counterintelligence chief, initialed the memo according to investigators who made the information available to the *Sunday News Journal*.

According to sources close to the Select Committee on Assassinations, the document reveals:

- Three years after Kennedy's murder... Helms and Angleton . . . discussed the fact Hunt was in Dallas on the day of the assassination and that his presence there had to be kept secret.

- Helms and Angleton thought news of Hunt's presence in Dallas would be damaging to the agency should it leak out.

- Helms and Angleton felt that a cover story, giving Hunt an alibi for being elsewhere the day of the assassination "ought to be considered."

. . . Asked to explain why a potentially damaging cover-up plot would be put out on paper, one high-level CIA source said, "The memo is very odd. It was almost as if Angleton was informing Helms, who had just become director, that there was a skeleton in the family closet that had to be taken care of and this was his response."

One committee source says the memo "shows the CIA involvement in the Kennedy case could run into the CIA hierarchy. We are trying not to get ahead of ourselves but the mind boggles." . . .

This secondary article by Trento and Powers is interesting (and revealing) for a number of reasons.

First of all, one of the co-authors, Joseph Trento, later admitted, under deposition in the E. Howard Hunt-*Spotlight* libel case, that he had seen the memo in question. Trento also noted that he knew the author of the memo, the CIA's former counterintelligence director, James Angleton—who had been fired by then-CIA Director William Colby in 1975—and, on occasion, had utilized Angleton as a source.*

And while the Trento story reported the CIA memo was dated 1966, the time frame in which the memo actually first appeared is subject, of course, to question, as is the actual *intent* of the memo since, as even the Trento article noted, a "high-level CIA source" considered the memo to be "very odd" in that it recorded—in writing—Hunt's alleged presence in Dallas at the time of JFK's murder.

But there's yet another critical factor here that once again points to the "Angleton connection" to the "Hunt in Dallas" story . . .

We know for a fact—as a consequence of sworn testimony in the Hunt-*Spotlight* libel case—that former Marine officer and intelligence writer William R. Corson—a known longtime Angleton media conduit—was the actual immediate source in 1978 for both Marchetti and Trento when they wrote their respective stories describing the Angleton-generated memo linking Hunt to Dallas.

Can there really be any doubt that—in leaking the story about the memo to Marchetti and Trento—Corson was clearly working as Angleton's "cutout," passing on the information that subsequently appeared in the two stories?

* In fact, many years later, in 2007, Trento released a book entitled *The Secret History of the CIA*, in which he wrote at length of his many encounters with Angleton, although he failed to mention anything whatsoever about the "Hunt in Dallas" affair. In many respects, Trento's book largely reflected Angleton's point of view, but—again, quite notably—steered clear of Angleton's ties to Israel and its Mossad. When interested parties, over the years, sought to question Trento about his connection to the "Hunt in Dallas" affair, Trento was evasive and ambiguous and tried to downplay its significance. And this, of course, was after *Final Judgment* had been widely circulated, focusing on the Trento-Angleton intrigue surrounding the Hunt memo. Am I suggesting that my book influenced Trento's prevarications? You bet.

The reason Angleton's memo *was* put on paper—and then released—was that Angleton *wanted* the story to appear in the press.

This was all part of a continuing misdirection—another “false flag”—regarding the real origins of the JFK assassination conspiracy. And this was very clearly the work of the Mossad's longtime asset inside the CIA and his media henchman, Robert Corson.*

And so it was that the now-infamous E. Howard Hunt—a low-level CIA operative (tarnished by Watergate)—was being hung out to dry by Angleton and the real conspirators.

So taking all of this into consideration, this further point should not be underestimated in its importance: Trento subsequently revealed to JFK assassination investigator Dick Russell that it was Angleton himself who leaked the memo (described in the Marchetti and Trento stories) to the House Select Committee on Assassinations. However, Trento told Russell, “It was all handled in such a way that Angleton was not the source.” Trento said that, in 1978—during the closing days of the House Select Committee's investigation and the time in which the “Hunt in Dallas” story was leaked to the media—Angleton himself had told Trento that Hunt had been sent to Dallas by a high-level Soviet KGB mole working inside the CIA. However, in retrospect, Trento said:

I later came to conclude that the mole-sent-Hunt idea was, to use his phrase, disinformation; that Angleton was trying to protect his own connections to Hunt's being in Dallas . . . My guess is, it was Angleton himself who sent Hunt to Dallas, because he didn't want to use anybody from his own shop. Hunt was still considered a hand-holder for the Cuban exiles...

* It's probably no accident that one of Corson's associates, in later years before Corson died, engaged in a longtime and determined covert effort to undermine the distribution of *Final Judgment* and to personally destroy this writer, Michael Collins Piper, and to also undermine Mark Lane, whose courtroom victory over Hunt [and effectively over Angleton and Corson] left the intelligence community reeling. The Corson-connected “black operation” against Lane and Piper involved distribution of disinformation documents (ostensibly from CIA files) purporting to “admit” CIA and Israeli involvement in the JFK affair. The phony documents were released with the expectation that they would be easily discredited, as indeed they were. Now the CIA and the Israelis proclaim: “The theory of CIA and/or Israel collaborated in the JFK assassination was based on fraudulent documents, so the work of both Lane and Piper is therefore discredited.” However, what the critics do not mention is this: *neither Lane nor Piper relied on those obviously forged documents.*

But that's another story for another time—but significant still indeed.

In any event—like the *Spotlight* article over which Hunt sued the Washington weekly—Trento's article (and his subsequent admissions to Dick Russell) clearly shed unusual light on internal CIA intrigue involving Angleton, Hunt and the circumstances of the JFK assassination.

That Angleton was the author of the memo addressed to his CIA superior (and longtime patron) Richard Helms is certainly of interest, considering Angleton's close relationship with Israel's Mossad.

And all of this, taken together, pinpoints Angleton as a key player in the events linking Hunt to Dallas—whether Hunt had actually been there as a *knowing* participant in a plot to kill the president.

In any case, when the Hunt libel case against *The Spotlight* finally went to trial in federal court in Miami in 1981, the newspaper suffered a devastating loss. The jury found in favor of Hunt and ordered *The Spotlight* to pay \$650,000 in damages. Fortunately, however, for *The Spotlight* an error in the trial judge's instructions to the jury gave the populist weekly grounds for an appeal.

When the case was successfully appealed in 1983 and ordered for retrial, attorney Mark Lane stepped in for the defense and the case finally once again went to trial in federal court in Miami on January 28, 1985.

Among the big names deposed by Lane during the Hunt case were: former CIA Director Richard Helms; former CIA Director Stansfield Turner; former CIA chief for the Western Hemisphere David Phillips; and former CIA and FBI man (and Watergate celebrity) G. Gordon Liddy.

This time, rather than pointing out that its article had only accused the CIA with attempting to *frame Hunt* for involvement in the assassination, *The Spotlight* went on the offensive and charged—flat out—that Hunt and the CIA had actually been involved in the assassination, a tactical move that put Hunt (and the CIA) on the defensive. Mark Lane—a skilled trial attorney who pulled no punches—adopted a combative “take-no-prisoners” approach and effectively put the CIA itself on trial.

In the end, the most damning evidence against Hunt and the CIA came during the second trial when Lane presented the deposition of former CIA operative Marita Lorenz, a German-born beauty who had been Castro's mistress but who, upon breaking with Castro, was lured by Hunt's associate—American mercenary Frank Sturgis—into the web of the CIA's anti-Castro operations.

Miss Lorenz testified that one day prior to the president's assassination she arrived in Dallas (traveling from a CIA “safe house” in Miami) in a two-car caravan on what she described as a secret mission, the purpose of which she had not been apprised. Accompanying her were several anti-Castro Cuban exiles and her CIA “handler,” the aforementioned Sturgis. The group was armed with telescopic rifles.

Upon arrival in Dallas, Lorenz testified, they met at their motel with Hunt, who passed money on to Sturgis and the Cubans. After Hunt departed, she said, nightclub operator Jack Ruby—who later executed Lee Harvey Oswald—came to the motel and met with Sturgis and the Cubans. Miss Lorenz testified that she felt uneasy about the events taking place and chose to leave Dallas that evening, returning to Miami.

When Hunt took the stand, Mark Lane pointed out numerous inconsistencies in Hunt's testimony regarding his whereabouts on the day of the JFK assassination. Over the years, Hunt had told several stories about where he had been on the day the president was assassinated.

In this trial, however, Hunt insisted he was in the Washington, D.C. area—at home in the suburbs or at the office or downtown shopping at one or more points during the day—on November 22.

Hunt's answers, while under sharp cross-examination by Lane, were inconclusive at best and left Hunt looking as though he had something to hide relating to where he happened to be that day.

And although during the trial a number of Hunt's former CIA associates came forth to testify that they had seen Hunt in Washington on the day of the assassination, their claims meant nothing, for (as we have seen) the damaging testimony from Miss Lorenz never suggested Hunt was in Dallas on November 22, only that she had last seen him in Dallas *the day before the assassination*.

And this, of course, would have given Hunt time to return to Washington and to be there on the actual day of the assassination.

At the very least, we know that Hunt could *not* have been one of the actual gunmen in Dallas, contrary to A.J. Weberman's suggestion that he was, masquerading as one of the famous "tramps."

For the record, however, note that a review of several published accounts of the story told by Miss Lorenz to various people over the years (at least going back to the time of the investigation by the House Select Committee on Assassinations) suggests that her arrival in Dallas with the Sturgis group could have been *as early as* November 20 and that she could have left Dallas *as late as* the morning of November 22.

But the basic story—to which Miss Lorenz testified under oath—is that she saw Hunt in Dallas at least one day prior to the assassination, not on the day of the assassination. And that was enough to raise questions as to why Hunt was in Dallas in the first place.

In any case, it was Miss Lorenz's testimony that turned the tide and convinced the jury that the CIA had been involved in the JFK assassination. The jury ruled in favor of *The Spotlight* and dismissed Hunt's claim.

(Later, Hunt's appeal of the verdict was rejected and the angry Hunt was even forced to pay *The Spotlight's* legal expenses.)

Although media accounts at the time desperately tried to dismiss the idea that the jury had rejected any thought of CIA involvement in the assassination, Leslie Armstrong, jury forewoman in the case, later issued a statement that settled the matter once and for all. She said:

Mr. Lane was asking us [the jury] to do something very difficult. He was asking us to believe John Kennedy had been killed by our own government. Yet when we examined the evidence closely, we were compelled to conclude that the CIA had indeed killed President Kennedy.

Now in light of what we have examined here, it appears that although in 1978 the Mossad's longtime CIA friend, James Angleton, was conspiring to implicitly frame Hunt for involvement in the assassination—painted as a "rogue" operative—by the time his libel trial against *The Spotlight* came to pass, Hunt and the CIA reached an accord.

It seems that both Hunt and the CIA determined that—whatever really happened in Dallas involving Hunt, Oswald and any other CIA-connected figures—all of that was better left alone. We can only speculate as to the motivations of Hunt and the CIA in this regard. And, as we've seen, the CIA actually provided Hunt with witnesses to his presence in Washington on the day of the assassination.

But that, of course, does not answer the question as to why Hunt was in Dallas *just prior to the assassination* engaged in activities that linked him to individuals later connected to circumstances surrounding the president's murder. And, as we shall see in the pages ahead, there is good reason to believe Frank Sturgis and his Cuban associates who were in Dallas and met with Hunt were indeed involved in the assassination.

At the very least, the fact Marita Lorenz testified Jack Ruby had met in Dallas with the Sturgis group suggests, at least in retrospect, some rather suspicious connections in place there. It doesn't prove, for example, that Ruby had *foreknowledge* of the impending assassination, but it certainly demonstrates that he was acting in concert with people who most likely were involved in the assassination itself.

Now although in the title of this chapter we referenced E. Howard Hunt as "the man in the middle" in respect to the JFK assassination, in the sense of what we have come to know about the circumstances surrounding Hunt having been publicly linked to the assassination, it seems almost more appropriate, even more so, to refer to Israel's good friend at the CIA, James Jesus Angleton, as "the man in the middle."

And, in fact, in the bigger picture, it might even be said that Angleton was "the man in the middle" of *the entirety of the JFK conspiracy*, a piv-

otal link between the CIA and Israel's Mossad, a point underscored quite thoroughly in *Final Judgment*. As noted, however, many JFK researchers prefer to avoid mentioning Angleton's close Mossad ties or—in the case of researchers like James DiEugenio and Lisa Pease—if they do mention the topic, dismiss the Mossad connection as being inconsequential.

Professor John Newman's book, *Oswald and the CIA*, makes it clear it was Angleton's CIA division that was monitoring—even manipulating—Lee Harvey Oswald, even long before the assassination, going back to Oswald's days as a former U.S. Marine-turned-"defector."

And the record clearly demonstrates it was Angleton who was involved in sensitive, top-secret CIA intrigue in Mexico City which took place over a month prior to the JFK assassination and which was designed to link Oswald to the Soviets and Castro's Cuba.

(Personally, I believe that it was Angleton who personally selected Oswald as the chosen "patsy" in the JFK assassination conspiracy.)

And we know it was Angleton who sent E. Howard Hunt to Dallas just prior to the JFK assassination, apparently on some pretext (the evidence suggests) relating to Lee Harvey Oswald.

And we know that it was Angleton who later drafted a memorandum—linking Hunt to Dallas—that Angleton personally leaked to the House Select Committee on Assassinations.

And we know that it was one of Angleton's favorite media "cutouts," William Corson, who leaked the story about that memo to at least two different journalists—Victor Marchetti and Joseph Trento—who wrote newspaper articles reporting the story about Hunt's presence in Dallas.

And we know that American-Israeli dual citizen A. J. Weberman—who gave impetus to the legend Hunt was in Dallas involved in the assassination (even as a gunman, posing as a "tramp")—began promoting this theory precisely at the time Angleton was launching his own parallel behind-the-scenes operation implicating Hunt.

And we know, by Weberman's admission, that one of Israel's most powerful advocates on Capitol Hill—the now-infamous Richard Perle—played a part in advancing Weberman's contacts at the time the House Select Committee on Assassinations was on the verge (under public pressure) of opening up a new inquiry into the president's murder.

It is my contention that Angleton's conspiratorial activities in regard to the JFK assassination—including his singular involvement in circulating the "Hunt in Dallas" story—unquestionably stem from Angleton's link to Israel and its role in the JFK assassination conspiracy.

And I have to say, without hesitation, that I was very much in the lead among JFK researchers in having specifically targeted Angleton as a chief player in the JFK conspiracy—a view only now echoed by others.

Even Professor John Newman—in an updated edition of *Oswald and the CIA*—has now pinpointed Angleton as “probably” being the “general manager” of those who were directly manipulating Oswald.

Citing the CIA’s staging of the scenario designed to link Oswald with Soviet KGB agents in Mexico City, Newman refers to this as a “virus” that could have threatened to spark World War III if people came to believe the Soviets were behind the JFK assassination. Contending that Angleton was the key player in this scenario—which he clearly was (as I said from the beginning)—Newman writes:

In my view, whoever Oswald's direct handler or handlers were, we must now seriously consider the possibility that Angleton was probably their general manager.

No one else in the Agency had the access, the authority, and the diabolically ingenious mind to manage this sophisticated plot. No one else had the means necessary to plant the WWII virus in Oswald's files and keep it dormant for six weeks until the president's assassination.

Whoever those who were ultimately responsible for the decision to kill Kennedy were, their reach extended into the national intelligence apparatus to such a degree that they could call upon a person who knew its inner secrets and workings so well that he could design a failsafe mechanism into the fabric of the plot. The only person who could ensure that a national security cover-up of an apparent counterintelligence nightmare was the head of counterintelligence.

But, naturally, of course, Newman doesn’t mention the Mossad. Nor would I expect him to do so.

In the end, looking back at what we have considered regarding all of this intrigue, is it really so outrageous, so beyond the pale, to suggest that all of this is not coincidence but conspiracy, and one that, on multiple levels, over a period of years, involves multiple individuals with intimate ties to Israel and its intelligence service, the Mossad?

In the chapter which follows, we will explore some unusual (and largely little-known) data relating to the actual circumstances of what happened in Dallas on November 22, 1963 that provide us at least some inkling of the template for terror that was utilized by Israel’s Mossad to carry off the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

And again, this template for terror was essentially the very same framework, the same pattern, that the Mossad later used in orchestrating the Oklahoma City bombing and the 9-11 terrorist tragedy.

CHAPTER SIX:

The “Dummy” Assassination: The Untold Story of E. Howard Hunt and the Events in Dallas

James Angleton was clearly the central player between the CIA and the Mossad in the JFK assassination and its cover-up and, in particular, in the later effort (in the mid-1970s) to frame E. Howard Hunt for involvement in the affair.

And as we determined in the preceding chapter, Angleton’s 1963 intrigues sent Hunt to Dallas just prior to the JFK assassination, at which time he interacted with individuals such as Frank Sturgis and the anti-Castro Cuban exiles (not to mention Jack Ruby) who were linked to the circumstances surrounding the assassination (whether or not they were actual participants in the events in Dealey Plaza) and its aftermath.

That Hunt was in Dallas, at Angleton’s direction, on an assignment involving Lee Harvey Oswald—later accused as the president’s assassin—is significant as well.

Little-noticed testimony we are about to explore suggests Hunt was linked indeed to the events in Dallas, but not as a conspirator working to arrange the murder of the president; that, instead, Hunt was in Dallas for another purpose entirely, and that Hunt had no idea that President Kennedy was indeed slated for assassination.

Our initial source for this little-known (and quite nuanced) bit of information is the 1987 book *There’s a Fish in the Courthouse*, by Gary Wean, a veteran law enforcement officer who formerly served on the Los Angeles Police Department’s criminal intelligence squad. Wean contacted me and visited me in Washington around the time his book was published and, some years later, when I wrote *Final Judgment*, his book proved a valuable asset in my research.

And although I knew at that time how pivotal Wean’s largely-ignored revelations were, today, in retrospect, in the wake of the Oklahoma City bombing and the events of 9-11, it is so obvious that the template Wean described relating to the JFK assassination fits fully in place with what we subsequently found surrounding the circumstances of those two later national tragedies that followed.

Having spent time on the Hollywood beat, Wean was very much tuned into to the underbelly of the motion picture capital and familiar with many of its denizens, prominent and not-so-prominent, ranging from the young Marilyn Monroe (whom Wean knew when she was an up-and-coming starlet and with whom he maintained contact after she became an international screen goddess) to the legendary Mickey Cohen, the Lansky crime syndicate’s man in charge in Los Angeles.

It was shortly after the JFK assassination Wean stumbled upon infor-

mation relating to the president's murder, rather explosive information that sheds new—and interesting—light on how E. Howard Hunt was apparently implicated in the crime of the century.

According to Wean, it was just several weeks after the assassination that he (Wean) happened to become acquainted with Dallas Sheriff Bill Decker through their mutual friend, Audie Murphy, the ex-war hero-turned-film star. Decker was visiting in Los Angeles and the three men got together along with another friend of Wean's and the talk turned to the JFK assassination.

(Decker, it might be noted, may be one Dallas law enforcement official who could be in the clear as far as any involvement in the assassination is concerned, since Decker ordered his men to investigate the railroad yard behind grassy knoll from where witnesses said at least some shots fired at the president's motorcade appeared to have originated. Were Decker a co-conspirator it doesn't seem likely he would have ordered his men in the direction of the presumed assassins.)

Wean, Murphy and Decker—all of whom were familiar with firearms—agreed with one another that Lee Harvey Oswald could not have carried out the assassination with the weapon he was alleged to have used. However, Decker went further, saying he was certain Oswald was innocent and proceeded to elaborate, adding:

I have another reason, much stronger, for knowing Oswald never shot JFK. There's a man in Dallas I've known a long time. He knows the entire truth about Oswald's involvement.

He's scared to death to go to the Dallas P.D. or FBI. There has been a terrible double cross somewhere and everybody is scared shitless of everybody else.

You wouldn't believe the crazy suspicions and accusations heaped on all law enforcement in the south by the imbeciles in D.C. and the chaos it has created.

There was no conspiracy in my sheriff's department involving the assassination nor in the Dallas P.D. I've known all these people too long. I would have known it. Believe me, something as "crazy" as this I'd feel it in my bones.

Later during a trip to Ruidoso, New Mexico, again in the company of Audie Murphy, Wean was introduced to Decker's source from Dallas, whom Wean said in his book was named "John."

At the time Wean wrote his book in 1987, he did not provide John's last name. However, shortly before *Final Judgment* went to press in January of 1994, Wean revealed to this author—during a visit to my

office in Washington—the identity of “John” who described to Wean, Decker and Murphy what had really happened in Dallas.

Wean told me that when he wrote his book describing his meeting with John, he deliberately did not reveal John's last name, although he knew exactly who John was, even at the time he met him.

What's more, Wean noted, he had slightly altered his physical description of John in order to protect his identity.

At the time Wean's book was written, John was alive. However, on April 5, 1991 John died in a bizarre airplane explosion that made national headlines. “John”—in fact—was John Tower who, in 1961 had been the first Republican in this century to win a Senate seat from Texas.

A stalwart CIA ally throughout his career, Tower took the secrets of the Iran-Contra scandal to his grave, having headed the commission which critics contend was a whitewash of the events, particularly of Israel's in-depth involvement in that affair.

And it appears that Tower also had inside information relating to the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

According to what John Tower told Gary Wean, CIA man E. Howard Hunt was indeed involved with Lee Harvey Oswald—but not in planning the president's assassination. Wean reported in his book that John told him that Hunt had something else in mind altogether.

Essentially, according to Tower, Hunt—like other leaders in the anti-Castro movement—was becoming frustrated with the Kennedy administration's moves to achieve at least an informal detente with Castro. Hunt, of course, had devoted much energy to the drive to undermine Castro and now all of his work was being undone.

Wean quoted Tower as describing what happened:

Hunt's festering frustration conceived what's become the most bizarre political assassination intrigue of all time.

His scheme was to inflame American people against Castro and stirring patriotism to a boiling point not felt since Pearl Harbor. Enraged Americans would demand that our military invade Cuba wiping out the two-bit dictator for his barbarous attempt to “assassinate” President Kennedy.

There was to be an attempt on the life of President Kennedy so “realistic” that its failure would be looked upon as nothing less than a miracle.

Footprints would lead right to Castro's doorstep, a trail that the rankest amateur could not lose. Unfortunately for Oswald he fit the bill perfect for Hunt's operation.

At first Hunt did not tell Oswald what his exact mission

was, except it was of the highest National Security priority. . . It was only two months before the “fake assassination” when Hunt gave Oswald the rifle, explaining his part in the plan.

Oswald was to fire three shots from his rifle “in the air.” He was to abandon it and empty cartridges at the scene and quickly leave the building for a rendezvous with agents who'd transport him to a secret destination.

He'd remain in hiding until after Cuba was invaded by the U.S. A fake trail to Mexico City ending at the Cuban Embassy would lead investigators to think he'd fled to Cuba, the belief that “Castro planned the assassination” of President Kennedy [which failed] and [that] the [attempted] “assassin” was being harbored under [Castro's] protection in Cuba would stir the Americans to a feverish pitch of anger

According to Tower, Hunt told Oswald that JFK himself was not aware of the plan, but high-ranking cabinet officers were in on the deal. Oswald would be free to come back and live as a free man after Castro was dealt with. Wean was also told that the famous “attempted assassination” of General Edwin Walker, the outspoken anti-Castro leader in Dallas, was also part of the plan to establish a pattern of violent activity by a suspected “pro-Castro activist.”

However, Wean reported, Tower told him that in the course of the planning for the fraudulent assassination attempt, something went wrong—there was interference from outside—from a power beyond E. Howard Hunt's immediate influence. Tower noted:

Of course, all covert operations have inherent dangers and are subject to break-downs. By my God, this was no break-down or neglect of performance, or even bad luck. What happened is incomprehensible.

According to Tower, Hunt's plan backfired. Shots were actually fired at JFK and the president was killed. However, John did not believe that the blame lay at the hands of either the Mafia or the anti-Castro Cubans. He believed that another force had intervened. Tower said:

It can't be that the Mafia or Cuban exiles [did] it. They had no motive, as they'd already been given inside tips an operation was underway that would return them to Cuba. It would have been totally stupid for them to interfere . . .

According to Tower:

Only a few of Hunt's most trusted men knew all of his plans down to the last detail. It is impossible to believe any of them is a traitor. Still it's clear, whoever shot Kennedy had to know all these minute details to pull it off the way they did. Something frightening, horribly sinister had interposed Hunt's mission.

Wean and Audie Murphy listened in shock at what they had been told and, at the time, Tower gave Murphy a packet of what he described as evidence which backed up his story. However, it was just several days later that Tower asked that they forget what they had been told.

According to Wean, Murphy informed him that he had been advised from Dallas by Tower that "Hunt and his agents have regrouped from their horrified panic and sprung back into action. Hunt's machinations and connection with Oswald had to be covered up at all costs." According to Murphy, military intelligence, the FBI and the CIA were all in a panic. Wean described the situation:

If their secrets were to be exposed they'd be rooted out in an eruption of calamitous national anger. In their nightmares all they can see is a firing squad. In fact they have solemnly determined that national security is at stake. That's their justification for a cover-up.

To assuage the fears of Tower in Dallas, Murphy assured Tower that the documents received from Tower had been destroyed. However, Murphy himself may well be one other on the long list of additional victims of the JFK conspiracy. In 1971 the actor died in a plane crash.

Wean, however, lived to tell the story of what he was told. In his book, Wean described how Hunt and Oswald both must have reacted if the story Tower told Wean and Murphy was true. According to Wean's assessment of what may have then happened:

Hunt and Oswald salvaging their senses from the paralyzing shock of Kennedy being murdered most certainly had identical thoughts: "I have been framed."

A double-cross of fantastic dimensions. The consequences were too devastating, and terrifying to grasp.

It was the end for them. Regardless of Hunt's convictions that his closest men were beyond suspicion, one of them was a spy—a mole in deep, deep cover.

And what is particularly striking is that Wean's rendition of what

Tower told him (as first described in Wean's 1987 book) bears a remarkable resemblance to the "Operation Northwoods" scheme by high-ranking U.S. officials first exposed fourteen years later in 2001 by James Bamford in his own controversial book, *Body of Secrets*, referenced earlier in the opening pages of *False Flags*.

Bamford, of course, cited explosive documents indicating that, in the early 1960s, U.S. officials were plotting phony terrorist attacks and other provocations to be blamed on Castro for the purpose of sparking a U.S. invasion of Cuba.

And, as we have seen, it is almost certain it was such a framework—such a template—that was utilized by outside forces (namely Israel's Mossad) to orchestrate the assassination of JFK, overlaying the template for a "dummy assassination" of the president—one that was supposed to fail—with a very real assassination plot of their own. And in subsequent pages, we'll explore other aspects of this further.

Now, as I've noted, a lot of self-styled JFK "truth seekers" have refused to acknowledge Gary Wean's controversial assertions, although it should be noted that Wean has been openly referenced as a source on the activities of both Marilyn Monroe and Mickey Cohen by other authors writing on the lives of these two Hollywood icons.

And it's probably belaboring the obvious to mention that the reason why Wean's revelations have been so carefully ignored—except in the pages of *Final Judgment*—is precisely because, in his own book, Wean dared to mention the likely involvement of the Mossad behind the events in Dallas.

However, in 2002—eight years after the publication of *Final Judgment* (and fifteen years after the publication of Wean's book)—one of the world's most widely-renowned journalists, Gordon Thomas, the author of multiple best-selling non-fiction works—including *Gideon's Spies*, a history of Israel's Mossad—confirmed the John Tower connection to the circumstances surrounding the JFK assassination.

In *Robert Maxwell: Israel's Superspy*, his biography of the colorful and corrupt Czech-born, London-based Jewish press baron, Thomas and his co-author, Martin Dillon, stated flatly that the intelligence files of Israel's Mossad, contained "a reference to [Tower's] role in the assassination of President John F. Kennedy."

Thomas and Dillon stumbled across Tower's JFK link while investigating the stormy life and mysterious death of Maxwell whom the authors contend was himself murdered by the Mossad.

A longtime secret Mossad operative, Maxwell was the individual responsible for the worldwide distribution (on behalf of the Mossad) of the PROMIS intelligence software that had previously been stolen from

the Washington, D.C.-based Inslaw company by Mossad-linked figures inside the Justice Department. (For more on Israeli connection to the Inslaw affair, readers may refer to my own book, *The New Jerusalem*.)

Thomas and Dillon revealed it was Tower, on the verge of retiring from the Senate, who—in return for a \$200,000 pay-off from Maxwell—helped make it possible for Maxwell (on behalf of the Mossad) to set up the process that allowed the Mossad to penetrate the U.S. nuclear facilities at Los Alamos and Sandia Laboratories in New Mexico.

Once Maxwell arranged for the facilities to begin using the PROMIS software, this permitted the Mossad—using a “backdoor” in the software—to steal U.S. nuclear secrets, which were then passed on or otherwise sold to Red China by Israel.

Much of which Thomas has written about Maxwell appeared in his previous book on the Mossad, *Gideon's Spies*, and in his book, *Seeds of Fire*. However, the information about Tower's JFK link was all-new except to those who had earlier read *Final Judgment* (and Gary Wean's book which provided the initial data utilized therein).

Thomas and Dillon that their revelations about Tower came from three sources: the CIA, the FBI and Britain's MI-6.

Regarding Tower's activities, the authors quoted late former high-ranking FBI official John O'Neill—who died in the World Trade Center on Sept. 11, one day after becoming the WTC security director—as saying: “It goes deep, that's all I'm gonna say about it. Be careful where you tread on this one. For some people it may be a very sensitive issue.”

Considering O'Neill's caution, it could very well be that O'Neill, by virtue of his longtime high-level position in U.S. intelligence, may have also been aware of Tower's “Dallas connection.”

So what about the “dummy assassination attempt” described by John Tower? In fact, there have been several widely-read works relating to the JFK assassination which have indeed suggested that Lee Harvey Oswald, at least, was roped into some sort of “dummy assassination” type of operation which he was led to believe was of the nature described by John Tower to Gary Wean.

Executive Action, the book loosely based on the film of the same name, presents Oswald as being manipulated in this fashion.

Likewise with the late former CIA contract agent Robert Morrow's 1976 work, *Betrayal*, a novelized version of events which Morrow based on his own “inside” information derived from his claimed involvement with figures linked to the conspiracy. Morrow reported that he had been told that CIA operatives, working with Cuban exiles, “had some kind of test they were doing, a fake assassination attempt against Kennedy.”

Later, in 1992, Morrow released a second work, *First Hand*

Knowledge: How I Participated in the CIA-Mafia Murder of President Kennedy which, this time, was described as the un-censored version of what he had presented in his earlier novel.

But just for the record, it should be noted that the publisher of this volume, SPI Books, is an American subsidiary of the Israeli-based Steimatsky Publishers, and, naturally, does not point in any way in the direction of the Mossad.

And in that book Morrow even mentions that Fred Weisgal—the American attorney who handled his defense in legal matters related to his CIA-connected activities which Morrow says tied him to the JFK assassination conspiracy—later moved to Israel where he became the Jewish state's federal deputy minister of justice.

And it should also be mentioned that this Robert Morrow (now deceased) is not to be confused with another "Robert Morrow" who is now active on the Internet writing about the JFK assassination, blaming Lyndon Johnson and the CIA for the crime, at the same time studiously steering clear of—and attacking advocates of—the thesis that the Mossad may have played a part in the crime.

Don DeLillo's novel, *Libra*, presents Oswald at the center of a "dummy assassination" attempt which was manipulated by others and went awry. (One CIA character in the novel bears a striking resemblance to E. Howard Hunt and is obviously based on Hunt.)

Another longtime independent investigator, Scott Thompson, who has written some of the best material published by the Lyndon LaRouche organization, believes that a "dummy assassination" scenario was indeed underway that day in Dallas and has gone so far as to charge that the provocation against Castro was being carried out with the full knowledge of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy (a possibility that we will explore further in these pages).

Thompson has alleged that E. Howard Hunt was, in fact, in charge of coordinating the fraudulent assassination attempt, noting, however, that "it remains unclear to this day who intervened into the dummy assassination set-up and turned it into the real thing."

In addition, in *Farewell America*, a famous and controversial book on the JFK assassination often reputed to have been sponsored by French intelligence, veteran French intelligence officer Herve LaMarre—writing under the pseudonym "James Hepburn"—suggested:

Oswald was probably told that he had been chosen to participate in a new anti-Communist operation together with [David] Ferrie and several other agents.

The plan consisted of influencing public opinion by simu-

lating an attack against President Kennedy, whose policy of coexistence with the Communists deserved a reprimand.

Another assassination attempt, also designed to arouse public feeling, had been simulated on April 10 against General [Edwin A.] Walker.

Veteran JFK assassination researcher, Dick Russell himself has pondered the possibility that the CIA's relationship with Oswald—whatever the nature of that relationship—was "usurped by another group." As Russell noted in *The Man Who Knew Too Much*:

Many people in the CIA had reasons to cover up their own relationship to Oswald, even if this had nothing to do with an assassination conspiracy.

In considering this plethora of possibilities . . . *what cannot be overlooked is that a **third force** was aware of the counter-spy web [surrounding Oswald] and seized on it to their own advantage.* [Emphasis added.]

For his own part, journalist Joe Trento (whose intimate and high-level involvement with the "Hunt in Dallas" story was described in detail in our previous chapter) told Russell his view of James J. Angleton's connection to Hunt's trip to Dallas, although, of course, Trento does not delve into the possibility that it involved any dummy assassination attempt. Trento told Russell:

Angleton was aware of a serious counterintelligence problem with the Cubans. They were making these crazy movements all over Texas and New Orleans. You couldn't tell who was who, and he knew the exiles were heavily penetrated by Castro's intelligence. Things were getting out of hand, and Angleton was trying to find out what was going on at the time of the assassination

For his own part, Russell has also pointed out that the anti-Castro Cuban exiles now believe that there was much more going on behind the scenes than even they realized at the time. According to Russell:

[Legendary longtime CIA contract agent] Gerry Patrick Hemming, who still keeps his ear to the ground in Miami's Little Havana, maintains that some of the exiles who thought they knew the score in 1963 have today become convinced that

they were being used.

They were incited to an anti-Kennedy fervor by being let in on the secret knowledge that Kennedy was seriously exploring accommodation with Castro. They were told that their dream of retaking their homeland was dead—unless something drastic was done. They took the bait.

Should it have become necessary in the design of the behind-the-scenes planners, the exiles were also expendable. Implicating a few Cuban refugees in the assassination was not desirable, but it would not come at a high cost, especially if . . . they had worked diligently to build a cover as Castro agents.

Small cogs in the wheel, they could also be made to disappear. So Cuban exiles were merely the base of the pyramid. They had no power to initiate the cover-up that followed. And neither did organized crime.

Hemming himself has spoken of at least one faction of anti-Castro Cuban exiles who seemed to be out of the conventional loop. According to Hemming:

It's hard to say exactly who this select group of Cuban exiles was really working for.

For a while they were reporting to Bill Harvey's ex-FBI CIA guys. Some were reporting back to [J. Edgar] Hoover, or the new [Defense Intelligence Agency].

There was *a third force—pretty much outside CIA channels, outside our own private operation* down in the [Florida] Keys—that was doing all kinds of shit, and had been all through 1963. [Emphasis added.]

Then after the assassination, a lot of us presumed that somewhere down the line, the KGB was orchestrating with Fidel to do the Dallas job.

Not until later did we figure out that most of the exiles being approached were being set up as patsies themselves.

And not by Castro or the Russians. It was domestic. Somebody like J. Edgar Hoover.

Who else had the power?

Dare we suggest an answer to Hemming's question—"Who else had the power?" Obviously, the answer is this: Israel, its Mossad and Israel's powerful domestic American lobby and its contacts at all levels.

However, there is yet one quite extraordinary piece of the puzzle

which actually implicates a known longtime Mossad asset with direct involvement in the events in Dealey Plaza.

It involves the apparent role by longtime international adventurer Frank Sturgis (often portrayed as a CIA contract agent in JFK literature) in the actual assassination itself.

In the course of her testimony in the case of E. Howard Hunt's libel suit against *The Spotlight* (described in the previous chapter), CIA asset Marita Lorenz testified that Sturgis told her afterward that, "We killed the president that day . . . Everything was covered in advance. No arrests, no real newspaper investigation. It was all covered, very professional."

And although some JFK researchers have expressed doubts about Miss Lorenz' story, Cuba's chief of counterintelligence, General Fabian Escalante, vouched for her, based on his own extensive study of the JFK assassination.

Escalante told journalist Claudia Furiati that Cuban intelligence had determined that, in fact, "Sturgis was in charge of communications—receiving and transmitting information on the movement at Dealey Plaza and the motorcade to the shooters and others."

If we are to believe that Sturgis was, in fact, involved in the actual mechanics of the assassination, the evidence suggests Sturgis could have been functioning as a knowing Mossad tool in the conspiracy, or, at the very least, have been indirectly working on behalf of the Mossad.

While this assertion will at first astound even the most seasoned reader of JFK assassination literature the following factor must be considered: What few people know is that Sturgis had ties to Israel's Mossad, going back fifteen years prior to the JFK assassination.

Writing in the July 1975 issue of *Argosy* magazine, F. Peter Model reported that Sturgis was a "Hagannah mercenary during the first (1948) Israeli-Arab war," and that Sturgis also had a girlfriend in Europe in the 1950s who worked for Israeli intelligence and with whom he worked.

(It should be noted, however, that Model has never taken a public stance implicating the Mossad in the assassination of President Kennedy. And, for the record, Model's former associate, one Robert Groden, has publicly denounced *Final Judgment's* thesis, saying it is "anti-Semitic." Groden made these remarks on a broadcast of the Internet forum of Alex Jones who prefers to focus on the theme that Lyndon Johnson was the prime figure behind the president's murder.)

Sturgis himself has even been quoted by JFK assassination researcher—and U.S.-Israeli dual citizen—A. J. Weberman as having said that Sturgis assisted his girlfriend as a courier in Europe in a number of her endeavors on behalf of the Mossad.

In addition, my own longtime friend and associate at *The Spotlight*,

former Time-Life correspondent Andrew St. George—who knew Sturgis well and spent time with Sturgis alongside Castro in the hills of Cuba during the Cuban revolution—also reported that it was well known among anti-Castro Cuban exiles that Sturgis had worked for the Mossad and had done so for a long period of time.

In fact, as St. George also revealed, during the heyday of the CIA's anti-Castro operations in Miami with which Sturgis and E. Howard Hunt were so closely associated, some 12 to 16 Mossad agents worked out of Miami under the command of Mossad Deputy Director Yehuda S. Sipper, their influence reaching throughout Latin America and the Caribbean.

Now in regard to Sturgis's anti-Castro activities—which are generally presumed to have been under CIA auspices—the importance of the following revelation cannot be ignored:

Citing a 1976 CIA memo, Professor John Newman who has investigated CIA knowledge of Lee Harvey Oswald's activities says that Sturgis founded the International Anti-Communist Brigade and that "the backers of Sturgis' group have never been fully established."

JFK writers Warren Hinckle and William Turner have said that "most of [Sturgis'] funding came from dispossessed casino owners and was funneled through Norman Roughouse' Rothman," who was, according to author Gus Russo, not only "the partner of Meyer Lansky" but also the original "mobster middleman" between the CIA and the Lansky syndicate in the Castro assassination plots.

Russo, however, says that Rothman's support for Sturgis came "from unknown sources" yet cites Hinckle and Turner as his source. So the question remains: just who really was funding Sturgis?

Could the Sturgis brigade have been part of the Mossad's Miami-based operations? It seems quite possible.

This speculation may not be far off the mark. Newman adds that a reported "sub-unit" of Sturgis' Brigade was CIA contract agent Gerry Patrick Hemming's Intercontinental Penetration Force (known as "Interpen"). Citing a February 1, 1977 CIA Security Office memo, Newman says the anti-Castro Cuban training grounds around Lake Pontchartrain outside New Orleans were run by Hemming as part of Interpen and that Sturgis was connected with those operations.

Those activities around Lake Pontchartrain are known to have involved two of the key players surrounding Lee Harvey Oswald prior to the JFK assassination: CIA contract agents Guy Banister and David Ferrie (both of whom were investigated by Jim Garrison and both of whom Garrison linked to Israeli-connected Clay Shaw in activities involving intelligence intrigue.)

In fact, there was an Israeli connection to Interpen. According to

Hemming himself, Interpen's "most important contact in the United States" was New York financier, Theodore Racoosin, whom Hemming described as "one of the key founders of the state of Israel."

After having read *Final Judgment*, Hemming frankly told the author in an email that although he personally had seen no evidence that convinced him the Mossad participated directly in the JFK assassination, he did say that "I have known since the late 1960s that the Mossad was aware of the JFK murder *even before it happened*, and they later did a full investigation on the matter and have since retained all such files." [Emphasis added.]

So, at the very least, if my thesis happens to be wrong—and the Mossad did not help orchestrate the murder of our president (though, of course, I don't think my thesis is wrong), Hemming's claim suggests that the intelligence agency of "America's best ally" knew that the American president was about to be assassinated and let it happen.

Perhaps—before it's all said and done with—some enterprising writer will come up with a book "proving" that the Mossad warned JFK that he was about to be assassinated but that JFK recklessly ignored the Mossad's warnings. (Sounds like a sure bet to get lots of publicity!)

Although I never met Gerry Hemming in person, at one point, during the 1980s, Hemming was supposed to come to Washington, DC to attend to some legal matters and our mutual friend, the aforementioned Andrew St. George, made arrangements for Hemming to stay at my home during his visit. Unfortunately, for me, Hemming's trip was canceled—or he made other accommodations—the details of the matter escape me—and I did not get to play host to this remarkable living legend who has since gone to his greater reward.)

But there's more regarding the apparent role of Frank Sturgis in some form of activity linking him directly to the JFK affair.

Shortly after *Final Judgment* was published in 1994, I was contacted by a well-known Washington, DC-based JFK assassination researcher, Michael "Mick" Levy, who showed me, during a visit to my office, a photocopy of a portion of a heavily-redacted handwritten document which Levy advised me was the work of Sturgis himself and which related to the activities of Sturgis in relation to the assassination of President Kennedy. Although Levy was careful not to let me read the entirety of the note I was able to glean this much: Sturgis specifically mentioned that he was working under the direction of the CIA's James J. Angleton.

Clearly, Levy wanted to keep the most explosive data to himself and I assume that it was Levy (rather than some government censor) who had redacted the names and significant details appearing in the letter.

Levy told me he had obtained the document from public files relat-

ing to a court case in Miami involving Sturgis (but which did not relate to the JFK assassination itself). Evidently the document was buried amidst massive court records and, consequently, had gone un-noticed, but not by Levy, a veteran in the field of digging through archival material relating to the JFK assassination. That was my last contact with Levy, although I later read an attack on me, by him, published on an Internet forum. Evidently he felt I had not provided him due deference.

Several years later, in January of 1997, there was an attempt to auction—for \$1,050,000, on Yahoo!Auctions on the Internet—what appeared to be that same handwritten letter and it was my presumption that the person auctioning the note was Levy, who had first shown me the portions of that letter in my Washington office.

A partial image of the letter appeared on the auction site and the descriptive material promoting the auction read as follows:

This is a signed copy of a letter in which its writer confesses to participating in various criminal activities with the White House and CIA officials in covering up President Kennedy's murder. [I have a copy of a culpatory lie detector test taken by him, as well as other supporting material, that will be included.] The man has long been connected to the JFK case, and he is discussed in a number of books and articles about the assassination; he is also, at last count, still alive—a so too are several of the people he names as having been involved in the murder plot. Among other things in the letter:

- He names the shooter on the grassy knoll and his back-up;
- He names the specially equipped weapon and specially made bullets used;
- He names a number of people who were involved in the assassination, to include its planning, execution and cover-up;
- He explains the reason for the release of the Nixon “smoking gun” tape, which culminated in Nixon's resignation;
- He states near its end, “You've got the confession you've all needed.”

I do not know what happened with this auction, but little attention has ever been paid to this unusual find, even among JFK researchers, and it may well precisely be because any in-depth exploration of the matter would point further to Mossad involvement (and that of Israeli loyalists in the CIA) in the JFK assassination.

However, the Sturgis connection to the events in Dallas does

involve yet even another Mossad link—one, again, which most JFK assassination researchers prefer to ignore.

In fact, two of the Cubans alleged by Maritz Lorenz to have been involved with Frank Sturgis in the events in Dallas are known to have been involved in a later assassination plot alongside yet another international adventurer with intimate ties to Israel's intelligence operations—even including the Permindex group detailed in Chapter Three.

The Cubans in question—brothers Guillermo and Ignacio Novo—were later convicted in the 1976 murder in Washington, D.C. of former Chilean government official Orlando Letelier. A man named Michael Townley who was connected with the Chilean secret police was involved in planning the Letelier murder with the Novo brothers. When Townley was indicted, he testified against the Novos.

Evidence now available from former Mossad operative Victor Ostrovsky suggests that Israel's Mossad, in fact, was indirectly connected with the Letelier assassination. According to Ostrovsky, commenting on the Letelier murder:

Nobody pointed the finger at the Mossad. And while the Mossad had no direct involvement in the hit ordered by Chilean DINA [secret police] Chief Manuel Contreras Sepulveda, it had played a significant indirect role in the execution through a secret deal with Contreras to buy a French-made Exocet surface-to-surface naval missile from Chile.

The death squad didn't use Mossad personnel in killing Letelier but they certainly used Mossad know-how, taught to them as part of the deal Contreras made to supply the missile.

It was the Novo brothers, who took the fall and served time in prison. No Mossad agents, however, were charged with the crime.

It is interesting to note, nonetheless, that Townley himself had interesting further connections with Israel. His wife, Ines, although a Christian, had spent time on an Israeli Kibbutz with her first husband, and maintained, according to authors John Dinges and Saul Landau, a long-standing "devotion to the cause of Israel."

Part of Townley's deal with the federal prosecutors, in the case of the Novo brothers, involved a plea bargain in which his wife received immunity from prosecution, although she had been implicated in terrorism alongside her husband.

However, Townley's other connection with Israel is far more significant. During Townley's long career as an international adventurer, he served—apparently from 1961-1966—as a mutual funds salesman for

financier Bernard Cornfeld's Investors' Overseas Service (IOS). It just so happens that IOS was a front for the operations of longtime Mossad arms procurement officer and financial wizard Rabbi Tibor Rosenbaum whose Geneva-based Banque de Credit Internationale was a central force in the web surrounding the Permindex operation that intertwined Israel, its nuclear arms program, the Lansky Crime Syndicate and even Clay Shaw prosecuted by New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison for involvement in the JFK conspiracy.

Over and over again, and not in an incidental way, these multiple levels of intertwining associations linked directly to the events in Dallas inevitably come full circle back to Israel and the Mossad, no matter how much certain JFK "researchers" will deny it.

In any case, we not only find CIA asset Clay Shaw of New Orleans tied to the Mossad through his association with Permindex (as were such other New Orleans names prominently linked to Shaw and the JFK affair, such as ex-FBI man and CIA asset Guy Banister and bewigged CIA pilot David Ferrie), but we also find two other CIA-connected players in the anti-Castro operations out of New Orleans (Frank Sturgis and Jerry Patrick Hemming) who were in the Mossad's direct sphere of influence.

And Lee Harvey Oswald was operating in the midst of all of these Mossad-connected players. In Chapter Four we saw how the Mossad's tentacles reached all the way to Dallas. In Chapter Five and in this chapter we explored the murky role of E. Howard Hunt in this drama.

In light of all of this, we are not venturing into the world of fantasy to suggest the operation involving Frank Sturgis and the anti-Castro Cubans who traveled to Dallas, arriving on November 21, 1963 to meet with Hunt (and then with Jack Ruby) was a Mossad "false flag" operation, deliberately involving a clique of Cubans manipulated by their Mossad-connected handler, Frank Sturgis—working at the direction of the CIA's Mossad loyalist, James J. Angleton.

Since, according to Marita Lorenz, Sturgis later admitted to her that his team did participate in the assassination, it is conceivable (as Gary Wean later described John Tower's version of events) that although Sturgis and his group did meet with Hunt in Dallas that Hunt himself did not know the Sturgis team was going to carry out an actual assassination or thought they were only involved in a "dummy" assassination designed to provoke an invasion of Cuba.

In our next chapter we'll explore the question as to whether, on his deathbed, E. Howard Hunt really did "confess" his involvement in the assassination of President Kennedy. The short answer is that he did not, and this will surprise many people who have been told that he did.

CHAPTER SEVEN:

The Trumped-Up Story of E. Howard Hunt's So-Called "Deathbed Confession" of Involvement in the JFK Assassination

Internet giant Alex Jones gave wide-ranging publicity to a story being told by St. John Hunt, the son of the late E. Howard Hunt, that in 2004—well before his death in January of 2007—his ailing father had provided what Jones trumpeted as a “deathbed confession” of Hunt’s involvement in the JFK assassination conspiracy.

And because, of course, the late E. Howard Hunt had so often (and so thoroughly) become linked to the JFK affair, it was inevitable that anything Hunt said, under any circumstances, about the assassination (after having loudly denied his involvement for years) would automatically be presumed to be the final word on the topic.

But for serious students of the JFK assassination a careful review of what E. Howard Hunt did—and did not—say is relevant, despite all the raucous rhetorical flourishes by Alex Jones and company that, in many respects, distorted what the elder Hunt purportedly said.

Now at this juncture, right up front, for the record, I should mention that I see no serious contradiction between the basic thesis of my book, *Final Judgment*, and what St. John says his father purportedly said about the assassination and CIA involvement therein.

There are basic differences, to be sure, but essentially the “revelations” coming from St. John do not refute (or, again, contradict) either what Mark Lane wrote in *Plausible Denial* or what appears in *Final Judgment*, although, of course, St. John makes no mention of Israeli involvement in the affair (nor, frankly, is it likely he would do so, even if he knew of—or suspected—such involvement).

I feel compelled to mention that since I am well aware that more naive and less informed individuals—not skilled in discerning nuances of discussion—would be likely to claim that I am dismissing the story told by St. John Hunt because it somehow “rivals” that which Mark Lane and I have outlined in our respective works on the subject.

This is not the case at all.

My doubts about St. John Hunt’s claims are not related to the *content* of his story, but rather, focus instead on the actual *origins* of the story: *that is, how—and under what specific circumstances—the story was obtained by St. John from his father.*

And that’s a very big point that must be understood. And it thus raises questions as to how “real” St. John’s story actually is. And this should probably be mentioned, at this point, as well: In spite of all of Alex Jones’ bombast, even what has been purported to be Hunt’s “confession” did

not even include the claim that Hunt was actually involved in the actual assassination itself or that he was a participant in the conspiracy to kill the president—only that he had foreknowledge of the conspiracy and more or less let it happen.

And that fact alone is something that many people who have heard of the “deathbed confession”—as touted by Jones—are largely unaware. Most people believe that Hunt actually admitted to having been a player in the assassination conspiracy.

But he did not—or maybe he did, kind of, sort of.

It all depends on which version you happen to hear about on the Internet and which version you choose to believe—or not believe.

And that’s just the beginning.

In fact, there’s some even more intriguing background to the whole affair of the Hunt “deathbed confession” that Alex Jones himself may only learn about when he reads it here in these pages.

With that having been said—and in the context of what I’ve already written about Hunt in the pages of this volume—it is my contention here—and always has been, as carefully delineated in *Final Judgment*—that if there was anybody on the face of the planet who did have inside information (or at least an inkling thereof) about the details surrounding the events in Dealey Plaza, it *was* E. Howard Hunt.

That conclusion was based on: (a) what Mark Lane had uncovered in his defense of *The Spotlight* in the Hunt libel trial; (b) what Lane had written about that case in his book, *Plausible Denial*; and (c) my own subsequent research, including that founded on the revelations of Gary Wean and other data that seemed to provide a foundation for what Wean had alleged. As I wrote in one of the later editions of *Final Judgment*:

All in all, if there's anybody who's alive today who knows what really happened in Dallas, it's undoubtedly Hunt. However, if Hunt should ever find the need or a reason to "go public" with "what he knows," I do believe we might want to take what he says with a grain of salt.

Hunt is a very skilled spy novelist and a prolific one at that, and if some publisher offered him a few million dollars to "tell all," it's conceivable that Hunt—in collaboration with the CIA, or maybe just on his own—will come up with some fantastic story that will satisfy the public craving and that he will, thus, set himself—and his story—as the final judgment as to what happened in Dallas.

And that could result in the truth being buried forever. I'm afraid too many people will be ready to believe anything Hunt

says simply because he is who he is. So let's be careful about believing what Hunt might say.

I will make this prediction, though: if Hunt does come forth with some "final solution" to the mystery that it will come down to a story that the assassination was a KGB conspiracy—with Castro connections—and that some "rogue" CIA operatives somehow got caught in the middle.

This could be the final linchpin for a last-ditch attack on Castro and since the Soviet Union has gone out of business, it won't really matter whether Hunt blames them or not.

Now, today, many years later I can reveal that I made that assertion regarding a possible impending "confession" by Hunt based upon some very real inside information revealed personally to me by Mark Lane.

During the late 1990s—probably around 1999-2000—I learned from Mark Lane (quite confidentially at the time) that Canadian journalist David Giammarco was engaged in a lengthy series of interviews with E. Howard Hunt.

During that time, Giammarco—who was very much interested in Hunt's possible role in the JFK assassination—was quietly and regularly consulting via telephone with Lane, asking Lane for possible questions to address to Hunt.

Ultimately, it seems, Hunt finally figured out what Giammarco's real interest was and Hunt said to the journalist (as related by Giammarco to Lane) in words to this effect: "Look, I know what you're really interested in. If you want to know what really went down with the JFK assassination and what I know about it, I'll tell you. But I'll need \$14 million dollars before I'll do it."*

Naturally, Giammarco was alternately intrigued and excited at the possibility of breaking a major news story, but also quite flabbergasted at the extraordinary request by Hunt of a \$14 million fee. At that juncture, Giammarco asked Hunt: "Why specifically \$14 million?"

Hunt responded: "That's what I've calculated I'll need to spend the rest of my life safe and secure from the people who will be angry if I tell you what I do know about the Kennedy assassination."

* In his book *Bonds of Secrecy*, St. John Hunt reported that his father, while working as a consultant to Oliver Stone on his film, *Nixon*, had been grilled by Stone as to his (Hunt's) knowledge about the JFK assassination. At that time, the younger Hunt reports, his father told Stone that he would tell him what he knew for the sum of \$5,000,000—a substantially lower figure than the \$14 million Giammarco described to Mark Lane.

Well, evidently, the \$14 million was never procured and Giammarco never got his scoop, but in December of 2000 the popular *Cigar Afficionado* magazine did publish an interesting article by Giammarco recounting his interviews with Hunt.

But that article did not include any kind of confession—although it did include Hunt’s denial of involvement in the assassination, despite the fact that the article often hinted that Giammarco believed Hunt knew more than he was admitting.

And I knew at the time (based upon what I had learned from Mark Lane) that Hunt had suggested that he did have a lot to tell, but that he wouldn’t tell it unless he got the \$14 million.

However, Hunt did do Giammarco a nice turn and, according to St. John, while his father was too ill to actually write the introduction to the journalist’s book *For Your Eyes Only: Behind The Scenes of the James Bond Films*, the senior Hunt allowed Giammarco to write the introduction and append E. Howard Hunt’s name thereto.

So when I speculated, in writing, in one of the later editions of *Final Judgment*, about the possibility of a Hunt “confession,” I knew a little bit more than I revealed, anxiously awaiting the possibility that some sponsor would come up with \$14 million and that Hunt would tell his “inside” story to Giammarco.

But, of course, it never happened—or, at least, to be accurate, Giammarco has never reported it, anyway.

Now considering the fact that, several years later, Hunt supposedly gave the now-infamous “deathbed confession,” consider this point: Most of the people Hunt named (and we’ll explore that in a moment) were already dead and those still alive were quite advanced in years and hardly a threat requiring \$14 million for Hunt to live out his life in safety.

So we can therefore conclude that what Hunt may have told Giammarco, in return for \$14 million, was hardly what Hunt’s son later purported to be the “inside” story of the JFK assassination based upon the “deathbed confession” touted by Alex Jones.

If my point is not yet clear, let me state it more directly: if Hunt did, in fact, know of Israeli sponsorship of the Kennedy assassination, a pay-off of \$14 million would have been quite reasonable. That’s the kind of money Hunt would have needed to ensure his safety. But whether even those who had been able to come up with that \$14 million could have assured publication of Hunt’s revelations is another question altogether. Israel itself—or billionaire friends of Israel—could have come up with \$14 million to buy off the sponsors and bury Hunt’s revelations forever.

But it gets even more complicated—according to St. John Hunt. And it also involves Giammarco. St. John has outlined a tangled story which,

in his book, *Bonds of Secrecy*, is rather drawn out, somewhat disjointed and difficult to unravel. But according to St. John, here is how the whole affair of his father’s “deathbed confession” evolved.

And, for the record, St. John says he never called it a “deathbed confession.” That, he says, was media hype.

As we already noted, much of the hoopla surrounding this affair was the work of Internet bigmouth Alex Jones who latched onto the claims made by St. John in early 2007—not long after his father’s death in January of that year.

St. John said his father had admitted to him in 2004 that he had repeatedly lied under oath over the years in relation to his possible involvement in or knowledge of a conspiracy to assassinate JFK—including, of course, in the trial involving my own *Spotlight* newspaper.

Coming just several weeks after Hunt’s death and in the wake of the publication of Hunt’s memoirs, *American Spy: My Secret History in the CIA, Watergate & Beyond* (in which their father flatly denied involvement in the assassination), these claims by Hunt’s sons initially seemed to provide a bittersweet vindication for those of us who had been on the staff of *The Spotlight*.

(But more about those memoirs later.)

However, a close study of the claims by St. John raises some very real questions as to the validity of what he says constitutes a “confession” by his father. The “evidence” he presents is obtuse and very much debatable, not so much as to its actual content, but as to its origins.

Let us explore what he has to say. Things are not so cut and dried as they may have initially seemed. It gets tricky.

The story told by St. John goes like this: In late 2003, St. John pressured his ailing father—who appeared to be dying—to reveal what he knew about the JFK assassination. St. John said he had been disturbed for years about charges his father had been a participant in the conspiracy and he wanted his father to finally tell the truth.

St. John Hunt said that, at the time of the JFK assassination, his father was away from their home in Maryland and that his mother had told him (at the time of the assassination) that his father was on a “business trip” to Dallas. However, St. John said he had no recollection of his father being at home with his family on November 22, 1963, despite his father’s insistence, in later years, that he was.

This is why St. John said he was so determined to get the truth out of his father before he died.

So, when his father finally agreed to talk, says St. John, his father described to St. John his foreknowledge of (and later discoveries concerning) the JFK assassination. And later, says St. John, his father actually

made an audio tape recording, describing other (limited) aspects of the assassination which St. John says his father sent to him by mail.

In fact, St. John did a very brief audio recording of his father discussing the assassination (purportedly made in 2004) and he also released a *video* recording of his father in which St. John can be heard addressing questions to his father. Or, perhaps, “coaching” his father, is a better way of putting it.

Later, we’ll examine the origins of both the audio and video recordings later, for a complete understanding of their origins helps us understand what Hunt did (or did not) say and under what circumstances he did say precisely what he did.

Although the point has been made, it bears repeating, particularly for those who need to hear the hard facts again and again: the recordings are not—repeat NOT—an admission of involvement by Hunt.

What we have heard seems instead to be a rambling verbal lecture by Hunt essentially pontificating about what *could* have been or *might* have been the framework of an assassination conspiracy.

In this regard, St. John has asserted that his father had told him that he had inside knowledge of and knew—in advance—of at least one CIA-connected plot against the president. St. John also said his father believed there may have been more than one plot to kill JFK and that his father said, “Thank God one of them worked.”

However, St. John said his father had specifically said he was not a participant in the conspiracy (the one he actually knew about); only that he was aware (in advance) of a plot by CIA officials to kill the president.

St. John also said that his father told him that it was only years later (when he was in prison with former anti-Castro mercenary Frank Sturgis, his fellow Watergate conspirator) that Sturgis—who admitted to Hunt his own involvement in the conspiracy—had filled in the details.

And note this: St. John has since written in his book, *Bonds of Secrecy*, that Lee Harvey Oswald “had in fact fired on the president that day,” but that there was another gunman, a French assassin, firing on the president from the famous “grassy knoll.”

As part of his “proof”—backing up the brief recording of his father talking about the assassination—St. John also released a piece of paper in his father’s handwriting: a hand-drawn flow chart of the various levels of the JFK assassination conspiracy.

The chart has Lyndon Johnson at the top. At the next level is high-ranking CIA official Cord Meyer. At the next level are longtime CIA covert operative David Morales and another top CIA official, William King Harvey. At the bottom is “French Gunman - Grassy Knoll.” St. John says his father also implicated CIA official David Atlee Phillips.

All of these people were long dead and hardly a threat to E. Howard Hunt, as we mentioned earlier—requiring the \$14 million that Hunt had told journalist David Giammarco he had calculated he would need to live out his life in safety if he (Hunt) told what he knew about the assassination of President Kennedy.

St. John says his father also told him that the "hit" on Kennedy was originally scheduled to take place in Miami, but that Vice President Johnson himself suggested that the event take place in his home state of Texas, presumably to make it possible for Johnson to direct and control the subsequent on-site investigation.

How his father came to unveil these secrets—including the claim that Lee Harvey Oswald was indeed firing on the president (a story which, as students of the JFK assassination know is dubious at best)—brings us back to the role of the aforementioned journalist David Giammarco whose private communications with attorney Mark Lane had come to my attention (via Lane) some years before.

In his book *Bonds of Secrecy*, St. John reports that actor Kevin Costner—who had portrayed New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison in Oliver Stone's *JFK*—was a friend of David Giammarco and that Costner wanted to do a documentary with the senior Hunt.

Hunt thought the documentary was going to be a profile of his extraordinary career, but during a brief meeting in Miami, Costner began pushing Hunt for a confession to involvement in the assassination, literally asking, "So, tell me Howard, did you kill the president?"

"I don't know what you are talking about," is what St. John says his father told Costner, bringing their visit to an abrupt close.

In the meantime, St. John approached Giammarco, asking for leads for a possible publisher for a book about his father's life. At that juncture, according to St. John, he and his father discussed possible ways of providing Giammarco what St. John called "certain information" to Giammarco and Costner "without giving anything away."

By this point in time, according to St. John, his father had, in fact, already admitted to his son that he had "inside" knowledge about the JFK assassination, already having provided his son the aforementioned audio tape recording relating to the assassination which was—more than anything—devoted largely to the discussion of the corruption of Lyndon Johnson and Johnson's hatred of John F. Kennedy).

St. John says his father also provided him with the aforementioned diagram "outlining the chain of command [in the assassination]" as well as a list of the participants in the assassination conspiracy.

As "proof" of his father's revelations, St. John has produced some of these notes in his father's handwriting.

What *is* interesting is that some of those notes specifically reference “Marita Lorenz” and “J.Angleton” although Miss Lorenz—who told the famous story about Hunt’s visit to Dallas that was a key element in the Hunt-*Spotlight* libel trial—and Angleton (the Mossad’s close collaborator at the CIA) have been dropped from the Alex Jones rendition of the so-called “deathbed confession.”

And that fact, of course, suggests that the Lorenz story (and the Angleton connection) are areas where some people fear to tread, precisely because the Lorenz-Angleton venue (as outlined in *Final Judgment* and in *False Flags*) does point toward the Mossad connection to the JFK assassination and the subsequent cover-up.

In his book—released after the initial burst of publicity generated by Alex Jones and by other media, St. John provides further data about the origins of the *videotaped* statements by his father—as opposed to the previously mentioned quite brief audio recording—that Jones has touted as part of the “confession.”

St. John says that Eric Hamburg, an associate of Hollywood filmmaker Oliver Stone, had approached his father with an offer to collaborate on Hunt’s memoirs and that the senior Hunt had agreed to “tell all” regarding the JFK assassination.

According to St. John, he and his father met with Hamburg at a Holiday Inn in Miami and it was there, on videotape, that his father told the story that has now been commemorated as part of the vaunted “confession” as hyped by Alex Jones in an Internet production.

In *Bonds of Secrecy*, St. John described the videotaped interview and admitted that “my father denied what he had previously told me.” And that may be a very significant (however unintended) revelation which, if put in context—as we are doing here—may raise some very real questions about the entirety of the circumstances surrounding the “confession” and what it actually constitutes.

Writing of the videotaped interview conducted by Hamburg, St. John claimed Hamburg—through round-about questioning—gave his father the means to talk about the assassination “without self-implication” and that his father was “equally as cunning in his choice of words.” St. John said that his father’s testimony was “slippery without being vague, and he let [Hamburg] guide him into answering questions while denying absolute first hand knowledge.”

In fact—and this is important—if one listens *carefully* to what Hunt *actually* says on the video we find such phraseology as “I think” and “may have” and “may very well have” repeated throughout.

It is clear that, time and again, St. John (who can be heard on the videotape prompting his father) is actually leading his father along, plac-

ing individuals and events in context, and essentially asking his father to agree with or otherwise confirm what the younger Hunt is suggesting may have been the outline of the assassination conspiracy.

So, in the end, it is not clear at all if we are actually hearing what the elder Hunt *knew* for a fact, but, instead, what he *surmised*. In short, what appears on *both* the audio and video recordings seems to be Hunt relating what is largely *an outline of Hunt's presumptions*.

What has been presented by Alex Jones (and St. John) as specific allegations are not always precisely that, but are, more than anything, apparent speculations. Call E. Howard Hunt's statements what you will: an analysis, an educated guess—perhaps even an informed judgment. But despite all the hoopla from Alex Jones, it is not a “confession”—deathbed or otherwise—in any sense of the word.

In the end, Eric Hamburg is said to have pulled out of the project because of the interference from the other members of the Hunt family who stood in the way of Hunt making any sort of confession relating to the president's murder in his memoirs.

As a consequence, the publisher assigned a new co-author and the book went into print—minus the intended confession—just shortly after Hunt's death. However, in the pages that follow, we will explore Eric Hamburg's own interesting background and raise the question as to what precisely his own real interests (and intentions) regarding the Hunt memoir really were.

And it should be noted that, according to St. John, his father's longtime attorney, Bill Snyder—whom the younger Hunt suggests (and probably quite correctly) was a CIA “handler” keeping an eye on his father—actively connived with the other family members in working to block publication of any formal “confession.”

In fact, St. John even mentions that it was his father's longtime close friend—and former CIA colleague—William F. Buckley, Jr., who had arranged for Snyder to represent Hunt in the *Spotlight* libel trial. But St. John doesn't mention—as we did in Chapter Five—that it was Buckley himself who was apparently paying Hunt's legal fees.

Now here is what is interesting, in light of what we have already explored in relation to the so-called “confession” and the circumstances under which it is purported to have emerged:

The truth is that what we have heard—in limited portions, from the videotapes of the Hunt-Hamburg interview—actually do reflect, practically in every respect, what ultimately appeared in the memoir: the contention (ostensibly in Hunt's words) that *if* there had been a conspiracy—and that was hardly an affirmation of any conspiracy—it was *likely* that Lyndon Johnson was the ultimate mastermind.

As *The Los Angeles Times* noted on March 20, 2007:

The memoir's published passages about the assassination have an equivocal tone. Hunt provides only a hypothetical scenario of how events in Dallas might have unfolded, with Johnson atop a pyramid of rogue CIA plotters.

In commenting on the excerpts from the videotapes of the Hamburg interview released by St. John Hunt and then widely circulated by Alex Jones the *Times* also pointedly and accurately remarked:

Hunt answers questions on a videotape using speculative phrases, observing that various named figures were “possibly” involved. A chart Hunt sketched during one conversation with St. John shows the same rogue CIA operation he describes in the memoir.

The *Times* rightly assessed the matter involving the claims by St. John: “None of the accounts provides evidence to convincingly validate that [E. Howard Hunt] disclosed anything revelatory.”

And so, while it is no pleasure to agree with anything from *The Los Angeles Times*—owned by hard-line Zionist real estate tycoon Sam Zell—in this instance the *Times* was very much on the mark.

The bottom line fact is this: the very brief recordings of St. John's father that have been released appear to be quite simply the elder Hunt's *speculation* about the framework of a conspiracy, coupled with his claims of what St. John Hunt *says* that his father told him that Frank Sturgis told his father of what he (Sturgis) knew from his own perspective. And quite often we are never quite certain what Howard Hunt is said to be relating from his own personal knowledge or from what he is reported to have been told by Sturgis (as described by St. John).

At this juncture, though, we would be delinquent, under the circumstances, in not commenting on the role of Eric Hamburg in all of this and thus raise the question as to precisely why Hamburg was so eager to steer—perhaps “control” is the better word—E. Howard Hunt through the writing of his memoir in the first place.

The official version—as has been rather naively parroted even by many JFK researchers—is that Hamburg is a dedicated and public-spirited truth seeker who—while working as a staffer on Capitol Hill in Washington prior to his Hollywood days—helped shepherd through the legislation that opened up the long-classified JFK assassination files to public inspection.

While that is seen as a feather in his cap and adds much to his bonafides in the eyes of JFK researchers, some cynics looking at the totality of Hamburg’s background might suggest that there’s more to the story than meets the eye.

Initially, one is inclined to rush to mention, again, Hamburg’s association with Oliver Stone, whose film *JFK* was—as we detailed earlier in Chapter Three—bankrolled by longtime Israeli power-broker, arms dealer, intelligence asset and all-around “man in place,” Arnon Milchan.

But it gets equally interesting when we start looking at Hamburg’s antecedents. Although now a player in Hollywood, Hamburg—a trained attorney by profession—is not your run-of-the-mill “movie mogul” (any more than the aforementioned Arnon Milchan).

In fact, Hamburg has a long and intimate history in high-level political affairs—especially in sensitive areas in the foreign policy realm—and it is a resume which indicates he personally has some interesting intelligence connections of his own. Excerpts from his biography, published on the website of Stanford University, follow:

From 1985 to 1989, Mr. Hamburg served on the staff of US Senator John Kerry in Washington, DC as a speechwriter and legislative assistant. He handled issues including South Africa sanctions, US-Soviet relations, judicial nominations and Vietnam veterans. He has also . . . clerked for Judge David Bazelon on the US Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C.

From 1989 to 1993, Mr. Hamburg worked in the US Congress for Rep. Lee Hamilton on the staff of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

In 1989-90, he was awarded a Fellowship in Arms Control and National Security by the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

He was also a Visiting Fellow at Stanford University during academic year 1989 at the Center for International Security and Arms Control, and published a monograph on legal issues in arms control.

No, not your average Hollywood producer! Now, some comments regarding Hamburg’s associations in official Washington—and you may take them for what they’re worth:

- U.S. Judge David Bazelon—who first brought Eric Hamburg to Washington where the future JFK “truth seeker” served on his judicial staff—is a rather interesting early mentor. According to investigative journalist Gus Russo, writing in his book *Supermob*—describing a tight-

ly-knit clique of Meyer Lansky-associated Jewish gangsters whose careers began in Chicago, later branching out to Hollywood, where they gained a foothold in the movie industry and to Las Vegas where they became major players in gambling—Bazelon (during the start of his own career) was one of this “supermob’s” key men in the federal Office of Alien Property who steered the confiscated property of Japanese-Americans—vast amounts of real estate and other assets (today worth literally billions of dollars)—into this hands of this crime network.

That Hamburg happens to be Jewish (like Bazelon) and a California native (where many of Bazelon’s early Jewish crime syndicate financial sponsors held reign) is probably also worth noting, particularly in light of the fact (as we noted in Chapter Three) that the Jewish crime syndicate was intimately connected to the very Mossad elements implicated in the JFK assassination conspiracy.

- Senator John Kerry (now U.S. Secretary of State) was almost assuredly a longtime CIA asset, going back to even his days in the military during the Vietnam War and later as a leader in the Vietnam Veterans Against the War. Kerry’s role. In my book *The Judas Goats* I explored Kerry’s own murky background in some detail. The Yale-educated heir to a number of trusts endowed by the wealthy “Eastern Establishment” Forbes family (of whom his mother was member), Kerry’s Senate career was notable for his role in a number of high-level cover-ups, including the fate of American POWs and MIAs from the Vietnam era, intrigues surrounding CIA (and Mossad) involvement in the Iran-contra affair as well as the infamous BCCI banking scandal. It was in this milieu that young Eric Hamburg worked for Kerry on Capitol Hill.

- Rep. Lee Hamilton (D-Ind.)—now retired—was a longtime Capitol Hill power broker whose main claim to fame is the role that he played, during the aforementioned Iran-contra affair, officially investigating the scandal, even as he was actively suppressing Israel’s central role in the matter. After leaving Congress, Hamilton served as vice chairman of the official U.S. 9-11 Commission which, needless to say, covered up the truth about the real origins of that tragedy which, as we shall see in later pages, most definitely can be traced to the machinations of Israel.

Now all of these “connections” by those who sponsored Hamburg’s rise in Washington that paved his way to Hollywood (and ultimately to Hamburg’s part in the Hunt “memoir”) prove nothing, but they do point to Hamburg’s central positioning in the corridors of power where the secrets surrounding the JFK assassination have long been the focus of conspiracy and cover-up. But those who hail Hamburg’s role in the legislation that brought the declassified JFK files into the public domain tend to ignore these interesting aspects of Hamburg’s background.

So it doesn't seem like a stretch of the imagination to ask whether Hamburg himself was acting in some way as an intelligence asset during his association with E. Howard Hunt, whether Hunt and his son were aware of it or not. Perhaps Hamburg's role, all along, was to ensure that what E. Howard Hunt really knew about the JFK assassination was indeed kept under wraps or at least muddied up.

That Hamburg abandoned the Hunt project in dissatisfaction, concerned that the truth was going to be suppressed, might well be just another cover story and the final job of polishing off the "approved" version of Hunt's memoir was passed on to someone else. *This is speculation, to be sure, but not out of the realm of possibility.*

Hamburg himself wrote an afterword to an updated edition of the younger Hunt's book in which Hamburg asserted his belief that E. Howard Hunt's purported allegations do have a ring of truth.

But what is particularly interesting is that, at one juncture, Hamburg writes that "in his account of the conspiracy, E. Howard Hunt named eight central figures" and Hamburg rattles off the names of Lyndon Johnson, such CIA officials as Cord Meyer, David Atlee Phillips and William K. Harvey as well as CIA assets such as the anti-Castro Cuban Antonio Veciana and covert operations specialist David Morales, and Corsican gunman Lucien Sarti. And, of course, Frank Sturgis.

What Hamburg does not mention, however, is that in Hunt's handwritten notes (mentioned earlier) the names "Marita Lorenz" and "J. Angleton" do appear. Hamburg does reference Angleton, in passing, but only in a discussion of the mysteries surrounding the death of Cord Meyer's wife, Mary, a mistress of President Kennedy).

Hamburg's notable decision to avoid discussing "Marita Lorenz" and "J. Angleton" are reminiscent, obviously, of what we noted earlier: that Alex Jones' public noises about the Hunt "confession" have also downplayed those names, despite the fact both names appear on the handwritten list of names prepared by Hunt. Again, it is as if Miss Lorenz and Angleton are being relegated to the Memory Hole.

Alex Jones' part in stimulating public attention toward the St. John Hunt story also bears inspection.

Despite his pivotal role in bringing the Hunt "confession" to a wide audience, Jones has done nothing to add to any serious discussion of the matter. Instead, reporting at various times about the so-called "revelations," Jones's website has presented some sharply conflicting versions, adding further confusion to the matter.

On May 7, 2007, Jones' website said that St. John said that his father "was more of a manager of the [assassination] plot on a command level," when, in fact, as we have seen, St. John has otherwise contended that his

father was not involved in any actual planning, but only knew in advance that an assassination plot was underway.

(And then again, St. John also said that his father only learned the actual details many years later—following Watergate—when he was in prison with Frank Sturgis.)

Then, on May 15, 2007, Jones's website reported that St. John agreed with what his father had described as his role as a "benchwarmer" in the plot; that is, that, as Jones put it, Hunt "wasn't one of the shooters but was intricately involved in the management aspects of the conspiracy."

In other words, not even Alex Jones—one of the big promoters of the "deathbed confession"—has even gotten it straight as to precisely what the younger Hunt claims his father did—or did not—say about his father's role (or non-role) in the planning of the assassination.

But that didn't stop Jones from continuing to hype the story and giving it far more national and international publicity that it deserved.

In truth, what Jones has put into such widespread circulation is an oddly disjointed, often out-of-context mishmash, if you will, of disconnected musings by E. Howard Hunt at distinctly different times under distinctly different circumstances and not at all the interwoven tapestry that Jones, in particular, has claimed.

For his own part, Jones has always trumpeted the claim that the ultimate mastermind of the JFK assassination was Lyndon Johnson and that any others involved—whether the CIA, the mob, whomever—were acting at Johnson's behest.

In short, the St. John Hunt story underscores what Jones has been saying for years, however inaccurate it may or may not be.

Jones has even loudly promoted *Blood, Money and Power: How LBJ Killed JFK*, the rather dubious 2003 book by Barr McClellan which insists that Mac Wallace, a longtime Johnson henchman, orchestrated the assassination plot on LBJ's behalf. The likelihood of even CIA involvement—let alone the Mossad—or any other power groups or intelligence agencies being involved in some way in the assassination is hardly ever mentioned by McClellan, if at all.

And since most of Jones' loyal listeners have probably never read McClellan's book, it would certainly come as a surprise for them to learn that this fanciful book even claims that Lee Harvey Oswald was right up there on the Sixth Floor of the Texas School Book Depository—alongside the aforementioned Mac Wallace—shooting at the president while another assassin, called "Junior"—but whose identity is never revealed—finished off the job from the infamous grassy knoll.

The trouble with this, of course, is that no serious JFK researcher believes that Oswald was on the Sixth Floor at the time of the shooting.

Instead a growing host of JFK researchers now agree with the Oswald Innocence Project (see their website at oswald-innocent.com) which has provided a wealth of photographic and other evidence indicating that Oswald was actually standing in front of the Texas School Book Depository at the street level at the time of the assassination.

Despite all this, Alex Jones has given wide play to McClellan’s egregious concoction since it underscores Jones’ determination to lay the blame for the assassination on the lap of the corpse of Lyndon Johnson—just, as we might note, that is precisely what the “revelations” from St. John Hunt have done.

(Incidentally, efforts by on-air callers to Jones’ program to mention Mossad involvement in the JFK assassination have been shouted down by Jones who—by the way—once actively sought to have the Internet broadcasts by yours truly, Michael Collins Piper, forced off the air.

(This actually happened during the same time frame in 2006 when I first began broadcasting, when Jones actually called in live to my program to “congratulate” me for my new broadcasts which he was secretly working to suppress. And that says a lot about Jones, as any honest person must acknowledge.)

In the end, the younger Hunt’s story portrays CIA players in the assassination as simply tools of Lyndon Johnson and completely disregard the oft-documented role of the Mossad’s man-in-place at the CIA, James J. Angleton, at the center of the circumstances leading up to the assassination and its cover-up in the aftermath.

The bottom line: it is certain that E. Howard Hunt *was* entangled in some way with the JFK assassination conspiracy and the circumstances surrounding the cover-up but the “evidence” presented by his son regarding what purports to be his father’s knowledge of the conspiracy is far from conclusive proof.

What we have outlined here in these pages (and before in *Final Judgment*) has far more foundation than the so-called “deathbed confession” of E. Howard Hunt.

And in the chapters that follow, we will explore, in more detail, other aspects of the multiple “false flags” that the real conspirators used to carry out (and cover-up) the JFK assassination.

CHAPTER EIGHT:

False Flags Upon False Flags: The Magic of Confusion; The Mossad's "Explanation" of "What Really Happened" in Dealey Plaza

That there were people in Dallas on the day JFK was killed who may not have known the real reason they had been lured there—having been tricked into involvement in circumstances surrounding the assassination—does point toward the classic Israeli “false flag” technique.

Although some JFK researchers doubt the claims of the Chauncey Holt—that he was the “tramp” in Dealey Plaza often alleged to have been E. Howard Hunt, one thing that Holt did say about what happened in Dallas on November 22, 1963 seems to be on the mark:

Dallas that day was flooded with all kinds of people who ended up there for some reason.

It's always been my theory that whoever was the architect of this thing—and no one will ever know who was behind it—were manipulating all these people.

I believe that they flooded this area with so many characters with nefarious reputations because they thought, “Well, if all these people get scooped up it'll muddy the waters so much that they'll never straighten it out.”

Holt's thesis is buttressed by a variety of other sources that, although wildly conflicting in their claims about the assassination in general, do tend to suggest that there was much deliberate misdirection designed to confuse even those who were participants in some aspects of the overall assassination conspiracy.

In his little-noticed book *The Squad*, Michael Milan suggests that there were at least several people operating in Dallas who believed that they were not involved in a conspiracy to kill John F. Kennedy, but, instead, in a conspiracy to kill Texas Governor John B. Connally.

Could some of those involved in the JFK assassination been manipulated into believing that they were involved in a plot against Connally (when, in fact, the real target was Kennedy)?

That doesn't really seem so extraordinary when placed in the context of the JFK assassination being the false flag operation that it so clearly was—as even acknowledged by “mainstream” researchers who otherwise studiously avoid daring to mention the dread word “Mossad” in relation to the president's murder.

It is possible that one of the assassins in Dealey Plaza did, in fact, take deliberate aim at Connally, perhaps not knowing that, at the same time, other assassins of whom he was perhaps not even aware, were, from another location, taking aim at JFK. Was the Connally shooter, in effect, a decoy? Speculation—of course—but valid speculation at that.

In his biography of Connally, James Reston, Jr. suggests that Oswald had been recruited by Jack Ruby as part of an organized crime plan to kill Connally, rather than Kennedy. Reston suggests that Kennedy was the victim, purely by chance.

While that claim is dubious at best, the unusual contention that Connally was the target (and that Kennedy was an unintended victim in the shooting) has some *very* interesting support.

Former Mossad operative Victor Ostrovsky wrote in his book *By Way of Deception* that part of his Mossad training included an in-depth review of the JFK assassination which was part of the required course of study for all new Mossad recruits.

Ostrovsky described what he called “one particularly intriguing aspect of the course,” which happened to be a documentary, prepared by the Mossad, entitled “A President on the Crosshairs.” This film was a detailed study of JFK assassination, based on the Mossad’s own purported analysis of the crime, and, according to Ostrovsky:

The Mossad theory was that the killers—Mafiosa hit men, not Lee Harvey Oswald—actually wanted to murder then Texas Governor John Connally, who was in the car with JFK but was only wounded.

Oswald was seen as a dupe in the whole thing and Connally as the target of mobsters trying to muscle their way into the oil business.

The Mossad believed that the official version of the assassination was pure, unadulterated hokum. To test their theory, they did a simulation exercise of the presidential cavalcade to see if expert marksmen with far better equipment than Oswald’s could hit a moving target from the recorded distance of 88 yards. They couldn’t. It would have been the perfect cover.

If Connally had been killed, everyone would have assumed it was an attempt on JFK. If they’d wanted to get Kennedy, they could have got him anywhere.

He added: “According to what we found, the rifle was probably aimed at the back of Connally’s head, and JFK gestured or moved just at the wrong moment—or possibly the assassin hesitated.”

Ostrovsky noted that the Mossad had every film taken of the Dallas assassination, pictures of the area, the topography, aerial photographs—everything. And that is interesting, to say the least, indicating a very particular interest in the JFK assassination on the part of the Mossad.

Is it possible that the reason the Mossad had so much information about Dealey Plaza was not because the Mossad studied the area AFTER the Kennedy assassination but BEFORE the assassination?

Was the Mossad's cover story (presented to its own recruits) a not-so-subtle way of telling those recruits that: "Yes, the Mossad did play a role in the JFK assassination and this is our way of telling you just that?"

Is this *really* such an extraordinary contention?

Anyone who suggests that is either a liar or a fool.

There were clearly many covert forces at work in Dealey Plaza, certainly beyond the comprehension of any one individual who had been drafted to play some role in the events that took place that day.

Some of the conspirators may have indeed been led to believe this was a Mafia hit on Connally and that it, in fact, in the end, resulted in the death of John Kennedy.

That the Mossad (in orchestrating the assassination of JFK) would utilize false flags and misdirection, designed to mislead even the actual assassins and others "on the ground" in Dealey Plaza is certain.

Is it possible that some of the conspirators at the lowest levels were led to believe that the whole operation was designed to kill the two proverbial birds with one stone: that is

(1) To eliminate Connally, who was allegedly perceived to be a roadblock in the way of the mob, and, in turn

(2) To force Kennedy—or otherwise give him the excuse—to finally take action against Fidel Castro who had shut down organized crime operations in Cuba?

Could some conspirators have been told the plan was to kill Connally and make it appear as though it were a Castro-sponsored bullet intended for the president which missed—and thereby force Kennedy into retaliating against Castro?

Imagine, for example, the surprise of a gunman firing at Connally when he realized another gunman was firing at JFK from another location in Dealey Plaza.

In that same vein, we recall, of course, how E. Howard Hunt himself must have felt—as the late Gary Wean related, based on the revelations from Senator John Tower—when JFK was killed in circumstances that linked Hunt to the players and events in Dallas.

One could spend hours concocting a variety of scenarios. In the end, of course, we will *never* know the *entirety* of what happened.

However, all of the evidence (compiled by a variety of researchers over the years) clearly suggests that the JFK assassination conspiracy was multi-leveled, ranging out in a variety of directions.

And although many JFK assassination researchers scoff at or otherwise defame my contention of Mossad involvement in the president's murder, we must wonder how many of them would ever dare criticize Israel's Mossad—the intelligence service of America's "best friend"—for putting forth the claim the assassination was a botched operation aimed at Connally and resulting in the accidental killing of Kennedy.

Why don't these JFK researchers simply go to the Mossad and ask for the release of its JFK files? One would think that if Israel is such a grand little ally that it would open the Mossad's files to the critics of the Warren Commission and demonstrate, once and for all, what really happened in Dealey Plaza, at least according to the Mossad, that is.

Could such a thing perhaps indeed be the next big new Israeli "false flag" plan in the works for the 50th anniversary of the JFK assassination or some time in the future? We'll have to wait and see.

If Israel were to make such a magnanimous gesture toward bringing out the truth at last—right from the secret files of Israel's mysterious and vaunted clandestine services that are the stuff of legend—the American people and the world would forever be in Israel's debt: the crime of the century would at last have been resolved. As international-known journalist and broadcaster, Mark Glenn has put it:

If the Mossad did, in fact, carry out such a public relations and propaganda venture, there would be all kinds of secondary and tertiary benefits that Israel would accrue from putting such a theory into the arena of JFK discourse.

But it would be an absolute disaster for the truth. This would stop all serious discussion of *the origins* of the JFK conspiracy dead in its tracks. Anyone who dared raise questions would be in the position of challenging Israel. And there are very few, in this day, who would want to be in that position.

The Mossad claim that JFK's death was just a big mistake is nothing more than—to borrow a phrase from Victor Ostrovsky—"pure, unadulterated hokum." But it could end up as the final judgment on the JFK assassination, the "official" word from no less than "God's Chosen People"—and that's precisely what many would consider it to be.

Now, let us move forward and further consider the role of the unfortunate Lee Harvey Oswald—the number one "false flag" in the JFK conspiracy—in the murder of America's 35th president.

CHAPTER NINE:

False Flag Number One: The Manipulation of Lee Harvey Oswald From New Orleans to Dallas

To my surprise and consternation, one of the most notable letters of criticism I received after the publication of the first edition of *Final Judgment* came from one (and only one) reader who pointed out a glaring flaw in the book—and I'm surprised that only one reader actually noticed it and took the time to point it out to me—and that is the fact that in the 335 pages of the first edition, the name "Lee Harvey Oswald" hardly appeared at all.

My focus had largely been on virtually all of the other "big name" players linked to the assassination. But the patsy—the alleged assassin—essentially came across as a "bit player" in the affair. And poor Oswald was anything but that.

Subsequent editions of *Final Judgment*, particularly beginning with the fourth edition sought to rectify the matter. And then, with the publication of the second printing of the Sixth Edition, I was able to bring readers the remarkable revelations (provided to me by an anonymous researcher) whose findings constitute what now appear as Chapter Four in this volume, *False Flags*.

The basic research by independent critics of the Warren Commission cover-up—led by Mark Lane's pioneering work, *Rush to Judgment*—established early on that Oswald was indeed the "patsy"—a classic "false flag." But as we shall see in this chapter, there are other aspects to the framing of Oswald that point in directions that—at least until the release of *Final Judgment*—had theretofore been ignored. And we refer specifically to certain aspects of Oswald's associations—particularly in New Orleans, during the summer prior to the JFK assassination—that point in the direction of Israel's Mossad.

At this juncture, I should point out that the failure to note these associations was not necessarily part of any deliberate cover-up. The truth is that, at this point, there was very little understanding (or knowledge)—if any—of JFK's secret war with Israel. Consequently, serious researchers had no occasion to look in that direction.

However, as noted in Chapter Two, Texas researcher Penn Jones did—early on—raise the possibility of an Israeli connection, and—later—New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison did likewise (albeit quietly) in an unpublished manuscript for a JFK assassination novel.

It is an undeniable matter of fact—as we now know, thanks to the work of so many JFK researchers—that Lee Harvey Oswald was being made to appear as though he were a pro-Castro agitator, possibly even

under the discipline of the Soviet KGB. Both during the time that he was in New Orleans and in Dallas, there were multiple manipulations designed to advance that “false flag.” Much has been written about these matters and is easily accessible on the standard writings relating to the JFK assassination conspiracy.

In New Orleans—as pointed out in *Final Judgment*—the activities of individuals such as Mossad-connected CIA asset Clay Shaw and others such as former FBI official Guy Banister and CIA pilot David Ferrie played a significant part in “sheep-dipping” Oswald, manipulating the soon-to-be assassination patsy into activities which portrayed him to the public-at-large as a sympathizer of the Castro regime.

And as we have seen, the circles of intrigue in New Orleans in which Oswald was enmeshed also included even soldier of fortune Frank Sturgis (a longtime asset, although not Jewish, of the Mossad).

In addition, of course, coming from the very highest level of the CIA—specifically, James Angleton’s desk at that agency—there was also orchestrated a scenario suggesting that Oswald had met in Mexico City with the Soviet KGB. Mark Lane’s *Plausible Denial* provides the best over-all summary assessment of how that specific conspiracy against Oswald was enacted.

So this much we do know: Oswald was the patsy—“False Flag Number One.” But there is much more to the story.

The likelihood is that were probably other people in Dallas on November 22, 1963 who were possible alternative patsies—others who had already been “sheep-dipped” as had been done with Oswald.

The people responsible for setting up these other patsies may have been those same people who had set up Oswald—or perhaps not.

Over the years a variety of JFK researchers have examined the possibility of other patsies being set up, but never utilized. The data on this matter can be found in a number of works, most notably in the pages of Dick Russell’s fascinating *The Man Who Knew Too Much*.

Was Oswald one of the shooters in Dallas? In our last chapter we mentioned the Oswald Innocence Project which has, in my view, effectively resolved the matter: It is now certain Oswald never fired a loaded round (or even a blank) at either John F. Kennedy or John Connally, if indeed he fired any weapon that day—including the weapon used to kill police officer J. D. Tippitt in the aftermath of the assassination.

As we’ve already seen, exploring the intrigues surrounding E. Howard Hunt, it appears Oswald may have been roped into the conspiracy by being told that it was a “dummy” assassination attempt to scare the American people into thinking action was needed against Fidel Castro, perhaps even led to believe JFK himself was behind the venture.

There is evidence to suggest (and we shall explore this later) that Oswald may have actually been directly or indirectly under the direction of one CIA faction (under the management of Attorney General Robert Kennedy) that was, in the end, co-opted and used as the template for terror used to bring about the assassination of President Kennedy.

And we contend here, of course, that it was the Mossad that co-opted that faction and thus effectively set up Oswald as the patsy.

We can only speculate about many of the specifics, but there is enough in the already-published literature (coming from a wide range of Warren Commission critics) that can point us in part of the direction.

For example, Oswald may have been instructed by his handlers to bring a rifle to the Texas School Book Depository (from where the Warren Commission later claimed Oswald fired the fatal shots). Whether it was his own rifle or another rifle or whether that weapon was actually used to fire any of the shots we will probably never know.

(There are some who question whether or not Oswald was actually the person who obtained the alleged assassination weapon through the mail to begin with!)

Based on what we have already explored in these pages, it seems likely that Oswald knew there was something going on in Dealey Plaza that day that may have involved, at the very least, the firing of rifles but that he didn't believe the rifles would actually be trained on either JFK or John Connally. Oswald was most assuredly thus surprised, to put it lightly, when he learned that the president had been hit by gunfire.

As a former U.S. Marine who had ostensibly "defected" to the Soviet Union—not a common venture, by any means—the CIA and the FBI (and the Mossad, for that matter) would have obviously had an interest in Oswald, whether he was a genuine defector at the time or not.

And if Oswald's defection was genuine, it is entirely conceivable that he later did a turn-about, dismayed with the Soviet Union, and then went to work *for* the CIA and against the Soviets and their Cuban ally. (This contention is one that JFK researchers do not ever seem to examine in any substantial way, but it is a matter that deserves consideration).

Was Oswald an FBI contract operative or asset of some sort? Because of Oswald's profile as a "defector"—whether genuine or not—the FBI would certainly have had an interest in Oswald.

If Oswald was a CIA-sponsored "defector" the FBI might not necessarily have known that and believed Oswald was "the real thing," so to speak, and upon his return from the Soviet Union put him under surveillance for that very good reason. Or if Oswald had been a genuine defector (who ultimately recanted) it is possible he volunteered his services to the FBI or was recruited by the bureau.

Shortly after the assassination a story circulated that Oswald may have been on the FBI's payroll as an informant, but there's a good deal of evidence to suggest that this story simply isn't true at all. However, if the story isn't true it has still taken on a life of its own and frequently pops up in literature about the JFK assassination.

The very fact that Oswald was working for Guy Banister in New Orleans does put him in the FBI's sphere of influence, inasmuch as Banister was a long-time high-ranking FBI official. The Banister connection also puts Oswald in the CIA's sphere of influence, not to mention that of Naval Intelligence (ONI), inasmuch as Banister was also not only a CIA contract operative, but, additionally, formerly with the ONI.

There have been those who have suggested that perhaps Oswald was even working perhaps as a Treasury Department informant, investigating the inter-state sales of firearms. There have been some who have devoted a great deal of research to this topic, notably Ray and Mary LaFontaine in their quite interesting work entitled *Oswald Talked*.

Ultimately what we find is that Oswald was apparently operating (wittingly or unwittingly) in many spheres of influence and for that reason alone he was an ideal patsy since he could be pinned (by the ultimate conspirators behind the JFK assassination) to any or all of the different groups which then, in turn, would have reason to want to cover up their association with an alleged presidential assassin.

There is strong evidence, cited repeatedly over the years, that there were other people posing as Oswald—going even back years before the JFK assassination. However, it can't be said with certainty that any or all of those impostors knew they were carrying out their masquerades for the purpose of furthering an aspect of what proved to be the assassination conspiracy. In some cases, it's a possibility that one or more of the "other Oswalds" was aware of the impending murder of the president, but there's no way we can know for sure.

The conspiracy would be far too compartmentalized for every participant to know precisely how he was being manipulated or utilized in framing Oswald. Some of those impostors had probably never laid their eyes on Oswald and didn't know who he was until after the Oswald (remembered by "history") was picked up by the Dallas police.

But things get even deeper—perhaps "scariest" is the word. In his own complex but still fascinating and revealing work, *Harvey and Lee*, author John Armstrong has painted a bizarre and frightening possibility that is not easy to dismiss: that, for many years, there were actually two "Lee Harvey Oswalds" living two very real but separate (although occasionally intersecting) lives and that, in essence, both were under the discipline and surveillance of the CIA and other intelligence agencies.

However, in *Final Judgment* I believe I broke serious new ground by pointing out that Oswald's association with Guy Banister may indeed point to a role by the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith (an arm of Israel's Mossad) in the "sheep-dipping" of Oswald as a "pro-Castro agitator." Many JFK researchers dismiss my considerations out of hand, of course, but in doing so refuse to face some very real facts.

In light of Banister's close relationship with A. L. (Bee) Botnick of the New Orleans office of the ADL, we have to seriously ponder whether Banister's use of Oswald had been arranged by the ADL which has long been known to have contracted out "fact finding" work through private detective agencies such as that of Banister's.

This is something we should address. Although Banister's historical profile is one of a "right-wing anti-communist racist extremist" etc etc (a profile the "liberal" JFK researchers like to portray), the fact is that Banister worked closely with the New Orleans ADL office. By all accounts, A. L. Botnick was what many would describe as an "anti-communist extremist" with a known hostility toward the civil rights movement, the ADL's posturing as a "civil rights" group notwithstanding.

In his book, *Terror in the Night*, the Pulitzer Prize-winning *Los Angeles Times* reporter Jack Nelson described how Botnick (who actually called himself a "super Communist hunter") and the New Orleans ADL office did, in fact, carry out covert intelligence operations against (and spied upon) "left wing" and "civil rights" groups, a point that confounds many liberal JFK assassination researchers who prefer to view the ADL as a vanguard in the civil rights movement (and who prefer to avoid discussing Banister's known ADL connection).

That Banister was also closely connected to New Orleans-based "right wing extremists" Kent and Phoebe Courtney, is an article of faith cited repeatedly by the liberal JFK researchers. What they do not mention, though, is that the Courtneys were devoted supporters of Israel which, in the context of our examination of Banister's ties to the pro-Israel ADL (and our contention of Mossad involvement in the JFK assassination conspiracy) lends an entirely new light to the matter.

Although Botnick himself was not in the New Orleans ADL office in 1963 (having transferred to its Atlanta office, returning to New Orleans in 1964), Banister certainly retained his valuable ties to the ADL.

And since we know *for an absolute fact* that Banister's ADL associates were looking into left-wing groups such as the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, it is upon this basis they could have deployed Oswald into the pro-Castro movement, a deliberate attempt to portray Oswald as a Castroite. That is, although Oswald was working directly under Banister he was, in fact, a "cut-out," acting as a "fact finder" for the ADL.

Banister may have been told that the ADL wanted "facts" about the pro-Castro movement and that Oswald was the man for the job. Banister himself may not have even known Oswald was being sheep-dipped for his ultimate role in the Kennedy assassination.

So it may have come as a surprise to Banister himself when Oswald was named as the assassin.

Banister himself was probably not as central to the actual assassination conspiracy as many have believed over the years. Banister himself was, in that sense, a "useful idiot" in the employ of the ADL and the Mossad and its allies under James Angleton's discipline inside the CIA.

Peter Dale Scott, the prominent JFK assassination researcher, has pointed out (as noted in *Final Judgment*) that you can look at Oswald's role as an employee of Banister and find various explanations for it: on the one hand you can view Oswald as a functionary of the intelligence community (in light of Banister's connections); on the other hand you can also view Oswald as a patsy of "the Mafia" in light of the fact that New Orleans Mafia boss Carlos Marcello provided financing for the anti-Castro Cuban exiles through Banister's CIA operations.

However, Scott himself acknowledges that this whole interplay between these interest groups through the Banister connection is part of what he calls a "gray" area representing the underbelly of finance and politics and international intrigue in New Orleans at the time.

But needless to say, Scott is not inclined to explore Banister's ADL connections—nor, in fact, does he mention them—and the obvious (or even not-so-obvious) implications thereof.

However, it doesn't end here as far as the "ADL connection" is concerned. If anything, it gets even more interesting, and a bizarre revelation regarding another Israeli link to Oswald and his sojourn in New Orleans popped up in 2004 in one of the most unexpected ways. And it is story that—once again—many JFK researchers prefer not to address.

Published in the December 3, 2004 edition of the international edition of *The Jerusalem Post*, in an article written by Arie O'Sullivan, the military correspondent for the *Post*, one of Israel's most distinguished newspapers. In his article, "The secrets of Dallas: 41 years after JFK, what my dad still won't tell me," we learn that the author is the son of Fred O'Sullivan, who, as a 26-year old New Orleans Police vice squad detective, testified on April 7, 1964 before the Warren Commission.

In retrospect, O'Sullivan's testimony and statements to the FBI and the Warren Commission and subsequent investigators for the House Assassinations Committee seem to have been somewhat (and perhaps deliberately) vague in some respects, as far as the precise links between Ferrie and Oswald are concerned.

And momentarily we may understand why that is the case . . .

O'Sullivan had grown up half a block from Lee Harvey Oswald and sat in front of Oswald in home room in school—their last names both beginning with "O"—and it was O'Sullivan who later recruited Oswald to join a Civil Air Patrol (CAP) unit in metropolitan New Orleans at the time the now-infamous David Ferrie was active in the CAP.

Writing in *The Jerusalem Post*, the younger O'Sullivan asserted that his father—then in a nursing home in Mississippi, his brain dimmed by strokes—did express his opinion that "Lee" had killed JFK "by himself" but added that, "Well, I have my suspicions who helped him."

O'Sullivan says "my father always intimated that he thought there was more to the story and that the plots to kill JFK and black rights activist Martin Luther King Jr. . . . crossed paths in New Orleans."

Now here's where it all gets interesting—at least as far as the likelihood of a Mossad connection to the JFK assassination and its cover-up is concerned.

It turns out that Detective Fred O'Sullivan ended up as commander of police intelligence in New Orleans and then later, as the younger O'Sullivan writes, "threw away our Christmas tree, lit the big brass menorah and took off for Zion land."

In other words, O'Sullivan converted to Judaism and left with his family for Israel where he became "Efraim"—no longer "Fred."

The younger O'Sullivan described how his father would "keep secrets better than anyone I have ever known." He wrote: "Once I stumbled upon a Lebanese driver's license in his name, with his photo in it, in his desk drawer. He shrugged it off, telling me it was for my own good I not know. I was brought up not to prod."

Obviously, ex-New Orleans intelligence squad chief Fred O'Sullivan went to work for Israel intelligence. O'Sullivan is telling us that without directly telling us that.

So the son of this trusted American Irish Catholic cop—who converted to Judaism and moved to Israel and worked for its intelligence agency—rose to become the military correspondent—no obscure position, by any means—for Israel's most prestigious newspaper.

But it gets *even more interesting* . . .

In 2006 the younger O'Sullivan went to work as the Director of Communications for the Anti-Defamation League's office in Israel, a post he left in 2008. Today, he serves as an anchor and reporter for Israel Television's IBA English News.

Does all of this "prove" anything?

No, but it is another strange piece of the JFK puzzle that has an unusual "Israeli connection."

The obvious question is *how far back* O'Sullivan was sympathetic to and/or recruited by the Mossad and what, if anything, he later did as a high-ranking police intelligence officer to hinder, for example, Jim Garrison's inquiries into David Ferrie and the Mossad-linked Clay Shaw.

And it is a known fact—as often trumpeted by the ADL itself—that the ADL has always (and to this day) maintained close relations with the intelligence divisions of police departments all across America.

The fact that the very individual who recruited Lee Oswald into the Civil Air Patrol—where Oswald met David Ferric, his first major contact in the intelligence community—later became a high-ranking police intelligence officer in New Orleans and then converted to Judaism, moved to Israel, where he worked for Israeli intelligence *and* that his son ended up at a pivotal post with the ADL—the group which maintained close ties to the circles manipulating Oswald in New Orleans—is provocative, *to say the very least*.

The possible involvement of the ADL in manipulating Oswald through Guy Banister is one of the unexplored areas of the JFK assassination—one that will probably, unfortunately, never be explored by JFK researchers any more than it has already been explored in *Final Judgment*. Let's not expect to find any ADL files on Oswald.

But the ADL connection—and the link to Israel—is there, no matter how much some people (who microanalyze just about anything and everything else related to the JFK assassination) refuse to admit it.

The bottom line is that Lee Harvey Oswald himself probably didn't know precisely who he was working for and that is the way the assassination planners wanted it. Oswald is probably one of the most-discussed and most-analyzed individuals in history, but we will never know who he really was or what his motivations were.

It is conceivable that Oswald thought he was playing a double or triple game and fooling everybody and was even more of a patsy than we realize. He's a tragic figure any way you cut it—an ideal false flag.

There is an interesting parallel, in this context, that should be noted. It's been reported that Oswald was fascinated by the 1950's television series, *I Led Three Lives*, based on a book by Herbert Philbrick, a former FBI undercover agent inside the Communist Party.

At the same time Oswald was captivated by Philbrick's adventures, so was an Indiana boy five years older than Oswald—one Roy Bullock. Inspired by Philbrick, whom he later described as his personal hero, Bullock launched what became a lifelong career as an undercover informant. He first went to the ADL and volunteered to infiltrate "hate groups." He also made similar volunteer efforts for the FBI and worked for the Indianapolis police department.

In 1957 Bullock even went to the Sixth World Youth and Student Festival in Moscow as an undercover informant and reported back to the FBI. And a consequence, it's quite possible there's a CIA file on Bullock as a "subversive" if the FBI never let the CIA in on the fact that Bullock was their boy.

It was only in late 1992 that—thanks in part to my own efforts (as described in my book *The Judas Goats*)—Bullock was finally unmasked as the longtime ADL undercover informant he had been for so long.

Now in light of the fact that Bullock was infiltrating both "left wing" and "right wing" groups over the years, Bullock himself would have been an ideal patsy had his handlers ever decided to sacrifice him.

In any case, in *The Man Who Knew Too Much*, Dick Russell explored the possibility there were a number of people in a number of cities being groomed as possible JFK assassination patsies due to their association with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, of which Oswald postured as head of its New Orleans chapter.

Another long-time international adventurer, Colonel Robert K. Brown (longtime publisher of *Soldier of Fortune* magazine) was himself reportedly a Chicago Police Department infiltrator in the Chicago branch of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee around the same time that Oswald was running around in New Orleans. This is interesting, too, in that Brown himself has long-time connections to Israeli intelligence.

This matter of "defectors" and "infiltrators" and "undercover agents" is complex and one can't always determine the motivations of someone operating in this unusual netherworld. It's a combination of that individual's personal psychology coupled with the capacity of the subject's handlers to manipulate that person's activities without necessarily letting them know who they are working for or why.

So as far as Lee Harvey Oswald is concerned, the possibilities of how he was ultimately manipulated are mind-boggling.

Did some faction in the CIA (perhaps even one under the control of the Kennedy brothers) actually set up a "dummy" assassination attempt (involving Oswald) that was designed to be linked to Fidel Castro and set the stage for a U.S. invasion of Cuba? And was this project co-opted and made into "the real thing" by the Mossad?

Or did some other force—namely the Mossad—use its influence inside the CIA and elsewhere to set up a so-called "dummy" assassination attempt (falsely presenting it as the work of the CIA or a faction thereof) and use that template to actually kill the president and frame Lee Harvey Oswald as the assassin?

Either, as we have seen, is a very real possibility, and in light of what we know of the story of E. Howard Hunt (as outlined in previous chap-

ters) the first scenario seems the most likely (whether or not either President Kennedy and/or his brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy were aware of the project.)

We'll probably never know the truth.

The bottom line is this: at all critical times when Oswald was being set up as the False Flag Number One—and following the assassination itself—the fine hand of Israel's Mossad is evident.

The very fact that it was the Mossad's loyalist at the CIA—James Jesus Angleton—who was the prime mover behind so many of the intrigues (both prior to the JFK assassination and afterward) that played not only a pivotal role in facilitating the president's murder and its cover-up, but also in setting the stage for Lee Harvey Oswald to be named as the patsy—stands alone as the ultimate proof that the Zionist agenda was the moving force behind the conspiracy that brought an end to the life of President John F. Kennedy.

In the chapter which follows we will examine a little-known aspect of the JFK assassination conspiracy that has been, in some ways, marginalized and forgotten, even by many of the most diligent among the JFK assassination researchers. This involves a short-lived "anti-Castro Cuban exile group" that popped up in April of 1963 and which folded shortly after the JFK assassination—a group which one of its founders said was being financed by "the Jews."

CHAPTER TEN:

**“We now have plenty of money.
Our new backers are the Jews—
as soon as they take care of JFK”**

While the intrigues (described in previous chapters) do point toward Mossad manipulation of a variety of personalities and events in Dallas and New Orleans as part of the JFK assassination conspiracy, another key to understanding how the Mossad used Cuban exile "false flags" in the JFK conspiracy may well be a comprehensive examination of anti-Castro Cuban exile Paulino Sierra.

It was the enigmatic Sierra who popped up in April of 1963, flush with cash, offering to "unite" the exile factions under the banner of a new entity of his own creation, the Junta of the Government of Cuba in Exile (JGCE). Numerous JFK researchers have referenced Sierra's intrigues, as did the House Assassinations Committee which determined that the JGCE had ties to anti-Castro Cuban groups that, according to a variety of sources, were linked to the activities of Lee Harvey Oswald prior to the assassination of the president.

This much is certain: the Chicago-based Sierra was "an unknown quantity to the Miami exiles," according to *Deadly Secrets*, Warren Hinckle's authoritative account of the not-so-secret war against Castro involving the CIA, organized crime, and the Cuban exiles.

While Sierra claimed "Las Vegas and Cleveland gambling interests" were financing him and, although a "considerable" amount of money was funneled through Sierra's employer, the Union Tank Car Company, Union itself disavowed knowledge of *the actual source* of the funds.

And while the FBI showed little interest in the well-funded Sierra, the CIA noted *two days before the JFK assassination* that Sierra "remains somewhat of a mystery man in terms of his means of support, and indeed, his long range objectives. Perhaps his mysterious backers are providing him with sufficient funds to keep the pot boiling *for the present.*" [emphasis added].

So even the CIA, it seems, had some questions about Sierra, his means of support and his long range objectives—or was at least pretending to do so. And this raises the question: Who, then, was really behind Sierra and financing his activities in the first place?

Although Sierra distributed funds to a variety of exiles, it has been said the "money was going down the drain with nothing to show for it." In the end, although the money never achieved anything as far as bringing Fidel Castro to heel, Sierra's funds may have, in fact, accomplished something: facilitating a certain element of the web of conspiracy that led to the assassination of President Kennedy.

In fact, Sierra and his "mysterious backers" funded the New Orleans-based Cuban exile training camp run by longtime Mossad asset Frank Sturgis where JFK assassination figures Guy Banister, David Ferrie and Lee Oswald and/or his "double" were seen in 1963.

And as we noted in Chapter Six, no less than famed anti-Castro mercenary Gerry Patrick Hemming—whose Interpen group was part of the Sierra-funded operation in New Orleans—admitted that Interpen's "most important contact in the United States" was New York financier, Theodore Racoosin, whom Hemming described as "one of the key founders of the state of Israel."

In the end—hardly more than a month after the assassination of the president—Sierra's "Cuban exile group" closed up shop in January of 1964 and, as Hinckle puts it, "was not to be heard of again."

It appears that Sierra's *real aim* had been accomplished.

And as history shows, it was Sierra who financed an arms deal—referenced on the first page of the preface of *Final Judgment*—about which a federal informant inside the Cuban groups (one Thomas Mosley) said he was told [by Cuban exile Homerio Echevarria]:

We now have plenty of money—our new backers are the Jews—as soon as they take care of JFK.

Now—as pointed out in *Final Judgment*—most JFK writers have carefully deleted the phrase "the Jews" when describing this incident, and/or change the word "they" to "we" or fudge by suggesting it was unclear as to whether it was "we" or "they" who were going to "take care" of Kennedy, the totality of the mysteries surrounding Sierra—coupled with what *Final Judgment* documents—points again toward a likely Mossad role in the JFK conspiracy. Here's why:

Since Sierra was funded by "Las Vegas and Cleveland gambling interests," that unquestionably points toward Meyer Lansky's chief Las Vegas point man, Morris Dalitz (formerly Cleveland-based), who was a shareholder in Mossad operative Tibor Rosenbaum's Permindex entity which, as we've seen, played a central role in the JFK conspiracy.

In short, Sierra's organization was a Mossad "front" designed to finance the New Orleans operations that facilitated the JFK assassination—through the activities of Mossad asset Frank Sturgis, Guy Banister and David Ferrie, not to mention Permindex board member Clay Shaw—and the financing was laundered by Lansky syndicate gambling ventures which intertwined with the Mossad's Permindex operation.

In addition, as former National Security Council staff member Roger Morris has shown in *The Money and the Power*, his landmark history of

Las Vegas—in which he notably points out the multiple Israeli connections of the syndicate figures involved—the Lansky casinos were deeply engaged in money laundering linked to covert activities of the CIA and also, certainly—although Morris doesn't say it—those of the Mossad, which intersected in many areas with the machinations of the CIA.

Much-touted JFK assassination researcher Peter Dale Scott—who has been a vituperous critic of the thesis that the Mossad could have played a role in the president's murder—has been particularly concerned about the circumstances surrounding the "our new backers are the Jews" story referenced earlier.

In fact, Scott is so determined to dismiss the possibility of Mossad involvement in the assassination—or anything pointing thereto—that he has actually suggested that the story relating to the "new backers" being the "the Jews" was concocted as part of a scheme by the real conspirators behind the assassination (whom Scott never names) to launch a public relations campaign blaming "the Jews" for the JFK assassination.

The problem with this, of course, is that although some anti-Semites did make such allegations their remarks were never—not once—given any credibility or promoted outside anti-Semitic circles!

And those anti-Semites who, at the time, were suggesting that "the Jews" were responsible for JFK's murder never, at any time, pointed toward the possibility of *Israeli* involvement.

Instead, they were suggesting that the "the Jews" behind the assassination were, rather, the communists, that is, the Soviet Union which—according to a theme then popular in anti-Semitic circles—was under the control of "the Jews."

So the truth is that any such theory that "the Jews" were behind the assassination had no public relevance at all and never reached any widespread circulation and certainly never gained any traction in the Jewish-controlled "mainstream" media in America.

As a consequence, needless to say, Scott—and others who make this claim (which many still do today)—ignore that quite relevant fact.

However—as they say—the plot thickens.

There's much more to the story and in this respect, at least, Scott may be on to something.

Scott contends that the story suggesting Sierra's group—allegedly funded by "Jews"—was involved in the assassination was part of a more subtle plot by the real conspirators (again whom Scott never names) to force Attorney General Robert Kennedy into blocking any serious inquiries into his brother's murder.

In this regard, Scott asserts that Sierra was actually a facilitator of anti-Castro operations being carried out by Robert Kennedy (on behalf

of his brother) as part of a behind-the-scenes "second track" even as JFK was making other quiet, friendly overtures to Castro.

In other words, while JFK—on the one hand—was moving to reach some sort of detente with Castro, he may—on the other hand—have also been facilitating a “back burner” operation designed to bring down Castro if the need arose.

There has been quite a bit of research (and speculation) surrounding this complex convergence of double-faced covert intrigue during that era of confrontation between the United States and Cuba and it does lend credence to the possibility that Sierra's operation (even while being a Mossad-sponsored front) did intersect with one of the Kennedy brothers' Cuba-focused intelligence operations.

In fact, Sierra's operation may have been part of the Kennedy effort with one Enrique Ruiz Williams allegedly being the contact point between RFK and Sierra.

The bottom line, in Scott's scenario, is that the possibility of involvement by Sierra's group in the assassination forced RFK into backing off from investigating JFK's murder because it could backfire, exposing Kennedy family plots against Castro.

And there has been some research in recent years which has suggested that, in fact, immediately following the assassination of his brother, Robert Kennedy recognized the name of the alleged assassin because, it has been said, Kennedy recognized Lee Harvey Oswald's name as one of those lower-level figures who had been involved in anti-Castro operations that were directly under his purview.

And all of this brings us back to the scenario surrounding a “dummy” assassination attempt being carried out by a CIA faction (linked to E. Howard Hunt in Dallas, described earlier in these pages) that was co-opted by the Mossad and turned into “the real thing.”

In any event, there is no doubt that Sierra not only had links to Jewish organized crime interests (which, in turn, were closely intertwined with Israel's Mossad), but that Sierra's other connections point in the same direction, albeit at another level altogether.

As even Scott points out, in April of 1963—the time he established his suspicious "Junta"—Sierra met with not only former CIA Director Allen Dulles but also Lucius Clay, a senior partner of Lehman Brothers, the famed Jewish "Our Crowd" banking firm, and attorney Morris Liebman. But what Scott doesn't mention is that Liebman was a major player in several high-level intelligence-connected institutions integral to what is known today as the "neo-conservative" network known for its determination to place Israel's security as the central concern of all U.S. foreign policy making. So Sierra's contacts reached far and wide.

What Scott strenuously wishes to avoid is the likelihood that the Mossad was Sierra's actual handler and that the Mossad co-opted lower-level operatives (in Sierra's web of intrigue) in a covert Kennedy-sponsored CIA-directed "dummy" assassination operation designed to spark a move against Castro and thus utilized them for the Mossad's own purpose, namely, the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

The Mossad would certainly have seen the brilliance in this remarkable template for terror: piggy-backing upon a top-secret (and potentially politically explosive) Kennedy family plot to topple Fidel Castro as the "cover" for its own scheme to remove JFK from the White House.

The Sierra connection to the intrigue surrounding the JFK assassination is little understood or recognized, as we've said, even by many of the more notably savvy JFK assassination researchers, perhaps in part because Sierra was operating out of Chicago and thus seemingly placed far beyond the things taking place in New Orleans and Dallas. But the evidence does point to the fact that Sierra's wide-ranging influence reached right into the circles surrounding Lee Harvey Oswald.

And it should probably also be mentioned, for the record, that there have been indications, over the years, that there was an apparent "Chicago plot" to kill John F. Kennedy that had been in the works. Which, of course, brings us back to our earlier point, made in the previous chapter, that it is almost a certainty that the overall scheme to assassinate President Kennedy had other facets, in other cities, with other operatives and patsies—false flags—in place. Dallas just happened to be the locale where all things came full circle.

All of what we have examined in the preceding chapters is only a brief overview of more than 768 pages appearing in *Final Judgment*—the most complete overview of all of the evidence pointing toward what I to this day—nearly 20 years after the release of that first edition of that book—still firmly believe is definitive proof (however circumstantial) of Mossad involvement in the murder of our 35th president.

But what we have seen here in the pages of *False Flags* has focused on the covert model—the template for terror—that the Mossad used at ground-level to bring about the assassination. And, as we shall see in the chapters that follow, it is hardly different at all from many of the same varieties of technique and manipulation that followed in the Oklahoma City bombing in 1995 and of the events of September 11, 2001.

Let us then proceed and review what happened in Oklahoma City and we shall likewise the apparent role of the Mossad in that explosive event that first brought terror—in a massive way—onto American shores. Oklahoma City, it seems, was intended to achieve what 9-11 finally did achieve, but it was a "failure" that came with great human cost.

CHAPTER ELEVEN:

Yes, the Mossad Was Behind the Oklahoma City Bombing . . .

If there is one thing about the Oklahoma City bombing of April 19, 1995 that is absolutely certain, it is this: undercover informants for both domestic and foreign intelligence agencies were surrounding accused bomber Timothy McVeigh, clearly tuned in to (and involved with and even directing) his most clandestine ventures.

Such private groups as the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) and the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC)—along with government agencies such as the CIA, the FBI and the BATF—were closely monitoring (and directing) the activities of at least a handful of individuals implicated in the Oklahoma bombing and the circumstances leading to that tragedy.

And in view of the ADL's central role in the affair—demonstrated in greater detail later in these pages—it is also accurate to say the ADL's foreign principal, Israel's Mossad, was definitely a key behind the scenes player in the events in Oklahoma City.

In fact, it is our contention here that it was the Mossad that was the prime mover behind the Oklahoma bombing, manipulating individuals and agencies on American soil, for the ultimate purpose of bringing about the tragedy; that the Mossad's intent was for the tragedy to be linked to the Iraqi government of Saddam Hussein and that this “false flag” could be used to force then-President Bill Clinton to invade Iraq and bring down Saddam, Israel's hated enemy.

There is unquestionably no doubt that links to the Mossad (and Mossad assets on American soil) can be found all over the Oklahoma bombing, and although there is a wealth of information that has continued to emerge surrounding the official Justice Department and FBI cover-up of the facts about the bombing, one particularly sad fact is this: even many of those who have been quite forward in publicly discussing aspects of this cover-up have been afraid to venture so far as to suggest the likelihood of involvement by Israel's Mossad.

Nevertheless, there is solid evidence pointing toward the role of some pivotal undercover informants in the circumstances surrounding the tragedy and, as we shall see, the involvement one of those informants in particular points directly toward the Mossad.

So with these considerations in mind, we must now begin dissecting the web of conspiracy surrounding the events in Oklahoma and taking a close look at the information that underscores our thesis.

And right up front we will say that the best place to begin is by introducing an individual named Andreas Strassmeir, a young former German army intelligence officer who was illegally in the United States (having overstayed his visa) and actively (if not somewhat prominently)

involved in the sometimes murky affairs of what is variously referred to as “the white separatist” or “white nationalist” movement and which is occasionally reckoned to be “neo-Nazi” in orientation.

On May 12, 1997, writing about the Oklahoma affair, syndicated columnist Sam Francis (since deceased) raised questions about Strassmeir whom Francis described as “perhaps the single biggest anomaly in the whole case” surrounding the bombing. And the fact that Francis had dared to suggest that Strassmeir was such a mysterious figure sent shock waves through the aforementioned “white separatist” movement, inasmuch as Francis, in many respects, was quite highly regarded by key figures in that movement.

Now, however, Francis was openly suggesting that there might be much more to Strassmeir than many in the white separatist movement believed. And that opened up a lot of uncomfortable possibilities.

But up until the time that Francis went public with his concerns, only *The Spotlight* and a handful of independent publications had questioned whether Strassmeir may have had some connection to the tragic events and dared to suggest that Strassmeir was actually something more than the hard-driving white separatist he purported to be.

However, on Oct. 20, 1997, *The Washington Post* rocked the otherwise complacent world of those who decry “conspiracy theories” by publishing a column by syndicated commentator Robert Novak that suggested that undercover government informants—specifically Strassmeir—may have been moving in Timothy McVeigh’s circle prior to the Oklahoma City bombing.

Novak focused on what he called “grave and disturbing questions” raised in a book by Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, the longtime Washington correspondent for *The Daily Telegraph* of London. The book, entitled *The Secret Life of Bill Clinton: The Unreported Stories*, opened with 108 pages of facts about the bombing unearthed by Evans-Pritchard.

Novak advised his readers that the English writer was “no conspiracy-theory lunatic” but instead “was known in Washington for accuracy, industry and courage.” Evans-Pritchard had “offered leads to discovering a pattern of lies and deception after Oklahoma City that, if verified, would approach Vietnam and Watergate in undermining American citizens’ confidence in their government.”

In particular, Novak described Evans-Pritchard’s inquiries into the strange activities of Strassmeir. Evans-Pritchard says he is “certain” Strassmeir was “under federal protection.”

The English investigator also examined the activities of another individual, Dennis Mahon, who was closely associated with Strassmeir prior to the bombing.

According to Evans-Pritchard, Mahon was convinced that Strassmeir was actually a federal undercover informant reporting back to either the FBI or the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (BATF)—or both—on the activities of so-called right-wing extremists.

Novak's report (based on Evans-Pritchard) echoed what *The Spotlight* reported (as follows) on June 16, 1997:

Americans relying on the major networks and on wire service reports about the McVeigh trial were told little—if anything—about proposed testimony by former paid BATF informant Carol Howe whose information could have shed light on not only:

- Foreknowledge by federal authorities of a plot to bomb the federal building in Oklahoma City; but also
- The possibility that a federal undercover agent was actively encouraging such activity . . .

On May 28, 1997, *The Denver Post* also gave its readers an account of Howe's allegations saying her testimony could have been "one of the biggest wild cards in Timothy McVeigh's trial."

Miss Howe charged that German immigrant Andreas Strassmeir had talked about bombing federal buildings.

The Denver Post also reported that "although the FBI and federal prosecutors repeatedly denied that either Strassmeir or Mahon were suspects in the bombing, documents turned over to the defense prove that they were and that Howe was extensively interviewed by federal agents two days after the bombing." The *Post* also reported that "the government has refused to talk about Howe."

Then, the judge in the McVeigh trial, Richard Matsch, ruled in what *The Rocky Mountain News* described on May 28, as a "closed door session" that Howe's testimony was "irrelevant" and would not be permitted.

Despite the successful effort to block Miss Howe's testimony, investigators who have been examining all of the evidence have repeatedly focused—in particular—on the role of the enigmatic Strassmeir.

The role of Strassmeir's close friend and attorney, Kirk Lyons, who popped up some years ago in the "right wing," is also drawing attention, inasmuch as it was Lyons who played a key role in spiriting Strassmeir out of the country and out of the hands of the McVeigh defense. (In fact, McVeigh is known to have actually called Lyons' office just prior to the bombing.)

This has led to speculation that Lyons was actually functioning as Strassmeir's "handler" for the federal government, which, of course, wanted to keep any evidence of its foreknowledge of any bombing conspiracies out of the reach of the McVeigh jury—particularly since its own reputed informant was perhaps acting as an instigator.*

Evans-Pritchard's new book also contained intriguing information about the likely identity of the now-infamous "John Doe No. 2." The English writer suggested that Doe No. 2 is actually a Pennsylvania man, Michael Brescia, who was seen with McVeigh and Strassmeir on at least one occasion. However, in the end, it is likely that there were many other "Does" involved as well.

According to Kirk Lyons, Strassmeir came to the United States because of his (Strassmeir's) interest in Civil War reenactments. Sounds innocent enough. However, in light of Strassmeir's involvement in "Civil War reenactments," it is worth noting, according to John Hurley—the longtime head of the Confederate Memorial Hall (CMA) in Washington, D.C.—that the CIA has frequently used Civil War reenactment activities

* In my book *The Confessions of an Anti-Semite*, I outlined in some detail how, over a period of years—well before the Oklahoma bombing—I had come to conclude that, although Kirk Lyons was much-admired in the white separatist movement, Lyons was almost certainly some sort of government informant. And as we now know for certain—particularly in the wake of the Oklahomba bombing—although Lyons postured as a "white separatist," he and his associate, Dave Holloway (also known as D. Michael Holloway) a former CIA pilot, (and their friend Strassmeir) were deep in the world of intrigue, betraying many good people who believed in them.

It is my personal speculation that Lyons (for whatever reason) had been co-opted by the federal government at some time in his career and allowed to express what may (or may not) have been his personal views on racial matters—perhaps akin to the manner in which the FBI permitted its informant, Bill Wilkinson—a leader of one influential faction of the Ku Klux Klan—to vent against Blacks (but not against Jews)—even as he (Lyons) was acting as an intelligence asset inside the white separatist movement.

Although, theoretically (and legally) nothing that any of Lyons' clients had said to him could be used against them in any potential criminal cases, due to the standard of attorney-client privilege, that did not exempt or deny Lyons the opportunity to forage for any details about his clients' associates and their activities and to later provide such data to the ADL, the Southern Poverty Law Center or to any number of law enforcement agencies. And that is what I believe that Kirk Lyons was doing for many, many years. And I don't think Lyons will dare to sue me for saying so, because he—if anybody—knows that I am *right on target*.

as a front for their own covert operations. Hurley is knowledgeable on these subjects, having tangled with the CIA when it used front men in an attempt to seize control of the CMA and use it for its “black ops.” In any event, British writer Evans-Pritchard commented:

It is assumed that Strassmeir could not have been a CIA asset because he was operating on U.S. soil.

But this is not necessarily the case. He could have been reporting to the domestic services section of the CIA, which has offices all over the country. Under usual procedures, his reports would be passed through them to the CIA’s Directorate of Operations. Or alternatively, he could have been an FBI operative working under CIA auspices.

My own conjecture, for what it is worth, is that Strassmeir was a shared asset, on loan to the U.S. government, but ultimately answering to German intelligence.

Evans-Pritchard also pointed out that the federal prosecutors portrayed McVeigh as “an anti-government radical set on avenging Waco” but have “downplayed” McVeigh’s links to the circles in which Strassmeir was operating. And, he added, “the U.S. press has followed suit. The question is why. Why deflect attention from the white supremacist movement?”

But it gets murkier. The June 8, 2001 issue of the *Times* of London featured a revealing story about Strassmeir, in which the authors concluded that Strassmeir probably was an undercover operative. The *Times* reported: “The syringe that executes McVeigh will also drain Strassmeir of significance; giving him the status of a footnote.”

In other words, it would eliminate the one person who could finger Strassmeir.

The newspaper noted Strassmeir could read Hebrew—Israel’s state language—as a consequence, it was said, of having had a girlfriend who served in the Israeli army, “not exactly the typical choice of a neo-Nazi,” the *Times* added.

In addition, the *Times* pointed out that when Strassmeir first arrived in the United States, he “found friends easily—retired Army officers, CIA veterans, history buffs—and became part of a network” which the *Times* said “is powerful in the U.S., a web of influence that stretches into the Pentagon and the federal agencies, in churches and boardrooms, on the oil rigs and building sites.”

This is hardly the profile of your average “neo-Nazi extremist” but certainly that of an intelligence operative.

Additional evidence brought forth by independent investigator J. D. Cash strongly suggests Strassmeir was the undercover informant who tipped off his federal handlers (who in turn then tipped off the German authorities) that Gary Lauck, a Nebraska-based publisher of so-called “holocaust denial” literature was making a trip to Denmark.

During that trip, Lauck was taken into custody and then deported to Germany to be tried, convicted and jailed under Germany’s “thought control” laws for his role in distributing literature (printed in the United States) that is illegal in Germany.

Although Timothy McVeigh’s first attorney, Stephen Jones, and later, his final attorneys prior to his execution—Rob Nigh, Richard Burr, Nathan Chambers and Christopher Tritico—all charged that Strassmeir was a key player in the Oklahoma bombing scenario, the U.S. media kept that information under wraps.

When McVeigh’s attorneys appealed to block McVeigh’s execution, they cited newly-released FBI documents which suggested that “there was . . . evidence, withheld by the government, that another person could well have been the mastermind behind the bombing.”

The attorneys named Strassmeir and his friend, Dennis Mahon, as possible co-conspirators, charging the FBI engaged in a “scheme to suppress evidence” of their roles, alleging that information in the FBI documents “suggested that one of the other participants in the bombing was an informant for federal law enforcement officers.”

In fact, in time, solid evidence began to emerge which most definitely pointed toward Strassmeir as an undercover informant.

The aforementioned independent investigator, J.D. Cash, and his colleague, ex-Marine Lt. Col. Roger Charles, pinpointed evidence, taken from a declassified FBI document, proving that *Andreas Strassmeir was an informant working under cover (posing as a “neo-Nazi”) on behalf of Morris Dees and his Birmingham, Ala.-based Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC), a private intelligence operation.*

The document, an electronic four-page Teletype message, dated Jan. 4, 1996, was sent by then-FBI Director Louis Freeh to FBI offices involved in the Oklahoma bombing investigation. The existence of this document was first exposed by Cash and Charles in the Dec. 14, 2003, issue of Oklahoma’s *The McCurtain Daily Gazette*.

Although heavily redacted, the document confirmed what *The Spotlight* reported about Strassmeir and his close friend and attorney Kirk Lyons. Within the document, the FBI director makes a reference to an SPLC informant being in place at the Elohim City “extremist” compound, on the Arkansas-Oklahoma border and confirms a telephone call was made to that informant on April 17 two days before the bombing.

Although the names of the caller and the person being called were blacked out by FBI censors, it had been documented that, around that time, Timothy McVeigh made a telephone call to Elohim City seeking to contact Strassmeir, who was reportedly unavailable to take the call.

The FBI memo further indicated that a person at Elohim City had “a lengthy relationship with one of the two indicted [bombing] conspirators” (McVeigh and Nichols).

Multiple independent investigators have documented that Strassmeir was with McVeigh on several occasions over an extended period, prior to the bombing.

The FBI, Lyons and others—including the SPLC—have insisted that this did not prove Strassmeir was involved in the bombing.

However, it is now clear—based on separate information, coupled with revelations in Freeh’s memorandum—that the SPLC informant was indeed Strassmeir.

Cash and Charles concluded that “references to an informant working for the SPLC at Elohim City on the eve of the Oklahoma City bombing raise serious questions as to what the SPLC might know about McVeigh’s activities during the final hours before the fuse was lit in Oklahoma City—but which the SPLC has failed to disclose publicly.”

Both investigators reported that when Dees of the SPLC was pressed to explain what his informant was doing at Elohim City, he offered the following explanation: “If I told you what we were doing there, I would have to kill you.”

Dees claimed that the SPLC didn’t have McVeigh on its “radar screen” until after he was arrested. However, that conflicts with evidence McVeigh was being closely monitored by the SPLC-allied Anti-Defamation League (ADL) as much as a year before the bombing. The ADL and the SPLC regularly trade spy data gleaned from informants.

Although the FBI said Strassmeir was expected to flee into Mexico “in the near future,” Cash and Charles point out that “none of the offices that received this FBI director’s memo [was in] Texas, where Strassmeir had just arrived and [from which he] was expected to make an escape across the Mexican border.” In addition, the FBI made no effort to visit Lyon’s office in North Carolina, where Strassmeir apparently hid out before fleeing to Mexico.

According to the *Gazette*, “Although Strassmeir was wanted for questioning in the Oklahoma bombing at the time of his escape and was illegally in the United States, those facts were known to attorney, Kirk Lyons . . . who has never been charged with harboring a fugitive, obstructing justice or disciplined by the [bar association] for his admitted role in assisting a client to elude federal authorities.”

The totality of the evidence, including the FBI memo, suggests Strassmeir was protected by the FBI, even before the bombing. Initially, the office of the BATF in Tulsa, Okla., had sought an arrest warrant for Strassmeir after one of its informants, Carol Howe, announced Strassmeir's reported plans to bomb a U.S. federal building. That was in February 1995—two months prior to the Oklahoma bombing.

The *Gazette* alleged that Bob Ricks, special agent in charge of the Oklahoma City FBI office, enlisted the U.S. attorney in Tulsa, Steve Lawrence, to prevent Strassmeir's arrest and a planned raid on Elohim City where Strassmeir was living.

In preparation for McVeigh's trial, his attorney, Stephen Jones, requested FBI documents relating to its surveillance of Elohim City. However, the FBI claimed it had no information linking McVeigh to anyone there, and that is now clearly shown to have been a lie.

So although Strassmeir spent seven years in the United States, including time after his visa had expired, he was never interviewed by the FBI, despite the fact he was associating with neo-Nazis under investigation, including several linked to a nationwide bank-robbing spree.

The FBI never needed to speak directly to Strassmeir because his handlers such as Kirk Lyons and the SPLC acted as conduits for Strassmeir and passed his information on to the agency. That has been a long-standing strategy employed by the SPLC and the ADL in the handling of intelligence from informants and the conveyance of that data to the FBI and other law enforcement bodies.

Thus, it is no surprise that Dees and the SPLC and the ADL have worked to suppress the role of Strassmeir in the bombing and quick to dismiss the charges about Strassmeir made by BATF informant Howe.

The attacks on Howe echo the same language used by Strassmeir's friend Kirk Lyons who, from the beginning, joined Dees and the ADL, along with all of the elite media trying to suppress the Strassmeir link.

That the ADL and Dees are adamant in discounting the involvement of a purported "neo-Nazi" in the Oklahoma scenario raises the question: "Why?" After all, the ADL and Dees have always reveled in finding "neo-Nazi" connections to any and all tragedies. The only explanation for the ADL-SPLC reticence to "linking" this particular "neo-Nazi" to a major act of terrorism is that Strassmeir was a "snitch" all along.

Now, in the pages that follow, we will explore the Strassmeir connection further and find, indeed, that the Mossad itself can be linked to his intrigues. And we'll also learn further that there is evidence pointing toward even Timothy McVeigh's ultimate understanding that he, like Lee Harvey Oswald before him, was but another "false flag"—another patsy—being manipulated in a frightening template for terror.

CHAPTER TWELVE:

Andreas Strassmeir: The Mossad's Man in Place in the Oklahoma Bombing

The Oklahoma City bombing was followed by years of independent inquiries by diligent researchers convinced (and rightly so) that the U.S. government covered up what really happened in America's heartland. After the bombing, there *was* a big cover-up going on—the patriot investigators were right about that—but they didn't understand “why.”

Although dissident assessments of the Oklahoma bombing did receive widespread attention in the “patriot” movement in America one thing about those critiques of the official government version of events was consistent: While all of those patriot-based critiques had distinctly differing theories—some blamed “the FBI” and some “the BATF” and others fingered “Bill Clinton and the New World Order,” or a combination thereof—none mention the possibility that the Oklahoma bombing conspiracy was ultimately manipulated by Israel's Mossad.

Most researchers avoided this data. and continue to do so. It was easier and less controversial to say: “The U.S. government orchestrated the bombing to pave the way for setting up a police state,” than to point one's finger in the direction of the Mossad.

But you'll notice that no police state emerged in the wake of the bombing, although the truth is that there were elements at work—linked, by the way, to the Israeli lobby—who did do their damndest to bring police-state style legislation into place.

Our thesis here is that Israel orchestrated OKC trying to frame Saddam Hussein for the crime so as to force Bill Clinton to wage war against Iraq. In fact, energetic efforts *were* made to link Timothy McVeigh to Iraqi Arabs in Oklahoma City who were said to be agents of Saddam. And in a subsequent chapter, we'll explore that further.

But—to his credit—Clinton wouldn't go along with the program. Clinton wouldn't buy into the Mossad-sponsored theme that the bombing originated with Saddam or from some element (perhaps even Osama bin Laden) in the Arab or Muslim world.

As such, Clinton ordered the FBI to opt for a “lone nut” explanation. The FBI purposely ignored or otherwise covered up leads “linking” McVeigh to Arab operatives and limited the inquiry to McVeigh (and his friend Terry Nichols) and cut off all investigations which extended into sensitive areas and individuals involved in the web of conspiracy manipulating McVeigh prior to the bombing. And we refer here, primarily, to the enigmatic Andreas Strassmeir whose bizarre history and we've already examined and more about whom we will learn in this chapter.

And to the extent that McVeigh *did* have any connections to Arabs prior to the bombing, those operatives were clearly assets of Israel's Mossad, although McVeigh, most assuredly, did not know that.

So what happened was that the Clinton administration refused to follow Israel's lead and instead covered up the "evidence" and "links" that Israel's Mossad laid in place with the intent of convincing the public that there was a "Middle East connection" to the bombing.

This intended "false flag" planted in place by Israel was hauled down by Clinton and company and Timothy McVeigh ended up being the primary patsy. And Israel failed to get its war against Saddam—at least then, anyway.

Next time, though, with 9-11, Israel achieved its goal and the United States went full force into the Middle East, fighting Israel's wars of survival, launching an all-out offensive against "Muslim terrorism."

There was indeed, let it be said, a Middle East connection to the Oklahoma bombing, but *it was the Israeli connection—not an Arab or Muslim connection.*

And although the now-defunct *Spotlight* largely stood alone in trying to demonstrate to independent-minded people of the point that Andreas Strassmeir and his associates were clear links to an Israeli connection to the Oklahoma bombing, a new book, entitled *Oklahoma City: What the Investigation Missed—and Why It Still Matters*, comes probably as close as any from a mainstream publisher ever will to hinting the Mossad had a link to the events in Oklahoma City.

The authors—Andrew Gumbel, a distinguished British journalist, and former Marine Lt. Col. Roger Charles—will probably cringe if they read this assessment of their findings, but it is on the mark.

Charles is interesting: A producer on some of ABC's OKC coverage, he also worked with the late independent OKC investigator John Cash and with McVeigh's defense team. He and Cash separately visited *The Spotlight* newspaper to find out what our team knew about the mysterious German, Andreas Strassmeir, whose murky activities linked to McVeigh are—as the book makes clear—a key to understanding OKC.

And please note this carefully: McVeigh himself told his cell-mate in federal prison—only to be revealed after McVeigh's execution—that *The Spotlight's* reporting on Strassmeir was on target.

While the book will disappoint many who devoted study to Oklahoma City, churning over minutiae perceived as "evidence" of a conspiracy, the book is "must" reading exactly because it explodes myths many patriots think are "gotcha" items proving a cover-up.

As in the JFK assassination and in 9-11, there are a lot of popular (now legendary) theories founded in misunderstanding, then passed

along by word of mouth and from one book to another, and which are now carved in stone in conspiracy lore.

Many well-meaning sleuths contributed to this state of affairs, and in the realm of the circumstances surrounding the Oklahoma City bombing, the authors of this book do a service setting the record straight.

They will upset some folks, but the truth counts, no matter whose feelings are hurt.

However, the book does prove there was a lot of outright cover-up and corruption—and incompetence—that led to the outrageously falsified U.S. government explanation of OKC.

The authors only go so far as to suggest that still-hidden strands of the OKC conspiracy connect to a gang of “white racist” bank robbers—linked to Andreas Strassmeir—who claimed to be motivated by their goal of a “white revolution.”

But it’s obvious the U.S. government was and continues to be determined to suppress all of this since its tentacles could lead toward a realm the government prefers to avoid.

In short, while the authors don’t say it, the truth is—as *The Spotlight* demonstrated in its ground-breaking OKC coverage—pursuing the “white racist” connection would lead directly to the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith and the Southern Poverty Law Center, both of which were in control of (or monitoring) individuals surrounding Timothy McVeigh.

And one of them was the aforementioned Strassmeir who postured as a “white separatist” but who was, Gumbel and Charles make clear, an intelligence informant protected at the highest levels.

The government did not pursue Strassmeir precisely because he was a direct link to Israeli intelligence, of which the ADL is an American conduit and which often operates on a strategic level with the SPLC. And the evidence indicates that the SPLC was utilizing Strassmeir as one of its agents. The authors outlined Strassmeir’s Israeli connections:

There were things about Andreas Strassmeir that his friends in the revolutionary Patriot Movement did not know and would have been intrigued, or appalled, to find out. Despite his pedigree as the grandson of a Nazi, he was fascinated by Israel and spent three summers on a kibbutz in the Jezreel Valley, near the Golan Heights. He had enrolled in Hebrew classes as a teenager in Berlin, and spoke the language fluently

During his second stint at the kibbutz, he was given an Uzi and put on security detail; during his third, he was sent on patrol on the Green Line between Israel and the West Bank, a

job usually reserved for the military. When he was asked in an interview if he had worn an Israeli Defense Force uniform, Strassmeir's expression changed noticeably and he broke into an embarrassed smile before insisting he had gone out in jeans.

Strassmeir acknowledged that he "bumped into" General Rafael Eitan, the architect of the 1982 Israeli invasion of Lebanon—an encounter captured in a photograph of them at Golan Beach, near Lake Galilee.

And he did not explicitly deny that he had contact with Mossad, the Israeli security service

Strassmeir was a German army officer by then, and his career took an interesting turn when he returned home: he was seconded to intelligence work. . . . [His] infantry battalion now used him to sniff out East Germany informants and spies. At some stage, Strassmeir was asked to fill in as the head of the battalion's intelligence unit, which gave him access to the army's internal reports.

This history strongly suggests that Strassmeir was not the radical right-winger he appeared to be, and might even have been a government agent of some sort, spying on extremists in the United States. . . .

Who might he have worked for? The Germans were certainly interested in intelligence on American radicals, because they worried that money and propaganda materials from the United States were fueling neo-Nazi violence at home. The Israelis were interested, too.

Despite all this—perhaps litigation conscious—the authors court the good will of Strassmeir's close friend and attorney, Kirk Lyons, wrapping up their eye-opening account of Strassmeir's Israeli ventures by parroting Lyons' claim that "Andi" was just a lazy kid they called "Sofameir," because he was always "sacked out." Yet one of Lyons' backers came up with an overnight express of \$6,000 cash to help Lyons spirit Strassmeir out of the country when government investigators initially looked in his direction. What do you think?

In fact, as we now know, it was the now-defunct *Spotlight*—whose reporters went on to found *American Free Press*—which was the one newspaper that wrote articles about the Oklahoma bombing that Timothy McVeigh privately said "hit very close to home," and *specifically in reference to the activities of Andreas Strassmeir*.

Our coverage in *The Spotlight* was unique (and obviously of interest to McVeigh) in that it focused on the "big picture," conveying evi-

dence McVeigh was a small cog in a wide-ranging conspiracy involving multiple intelligence agencies and informants working with McVeigh and his inner circle and manipulating their actions. And that, ultimately, to be found in the background, was Israel's Mossad.

Now much of what *The Spotlight* first wrote has finally been confirmed for the first time. Although McVeigh publicly claimed he was a "lone bomber," privately he said *The Spotlight* was aiming in the right direction, even thwarting his effort to claim a singular role in history.

Two of McVeigh's friends from death row at the federal prison in Indiana published a book telling the "inside" story of the bombing, based largely on what McVeigh told them really happened. *Secrets Worth Dying For*, by David Paul Hammer and Jeffrey William Paul, probably comes much closer to the truth than any other book on the subject.

And although McVeigh publicly proclaimed himself as a "lone bomber"—even dismissing the role of his friend, Terry Nichols—McVeigh told a far different version to his friends in prison. As such, what *Secrets* reported is far more credible than what is found in "mainstream" media books.

The Hammer-Paul book contends that McVeigh was recruited (while still in the military) by one of his superiors to immerse himself in the rhetoric and lifestyle of the American "militia" and "patriot" movements, traveling from gun show to gun show, reporting back his findings. In short, McVeigh was a federal "snitch."

However, although unusual from a psychological standpoint, McVeigh evidently shared the views of those he was informing on.

Eventually, McVeigh was ordered to organize a team of "extremists" to carry out a terrorist bombing in the United States in order to give the federal authorities the opportunity to crack down on political dissidents in this country. McVeigh did orchestrate a bombing conspiracy (the details of which he reported back to his superiors) and that conspiracy included at least one other undercover informant, the now-notorious Andreas Strassmeir.

McVeigh himself sent a letter to this author, Michael Collins Piper, from his cell on death row at the federal prison in Terre Haute, Indiana. Inside the envelope was a print-out of an article about an individual named Cary Gagan who claimed to have inside knowledge about the Oklahoma bombing. In his own handwriting on the print-out, McVeigh wrote, "One lie too many smokes out a con artist," evidently suggesting that Gagan was a liar.

But what made this note from McVeigh interesting was the fact that never once had I written anything about Gagan. Instead, my writing for *The Spotlight* focused almost exclusively on the Strassmeir connection.

My immediate reaction to receiving this note from McVeigh was to make the deduction that McVeigh was indirectly communicating to me (through a round-about, indirect means) was that *what I actually had written was on the mark*.

And now, of course, I have the satisfaction of knowing that I was very much on target, much to the dismay of Andreas Strassmeir, Kirk Lyons and all of their allies and handlers (both here on American soil and in Israel and elsewhere) in the murky world of covert action.

Another odd item that should be mentioned for the historical record—and this is a point that has been widely forgotten, even among the most thorough of the independent Oklahoma City researchers—the existence of another mysterious McVeigh associate: the guy with the red sports car, first brought to attention by British journalist Ambrose Evans-Pritchard and later publicized by *The Spotlight*.

Catina Lawson, a young lady in Kansas who came to know McVeigh circa 1992 (when McVeigh was tooling about the country mixing it up the militia groups, white separatists, and Andreas Strassmeir) described the mystery man: "It was weird that summer. There was always this elder gentleman with Tim, mid 40-ish, with a red sports car. He seemed out of place, but he was always around."

Other witnesses report seeing McVeigh with this same character in Kansas during that same time frame. Yet of all of the players in the Oklahoma affair who have been identified, to one degree or another (however incorrectly, in some cases, we might add), no one—including British journalist Evans-Pritchard who discovered him—seems to have been able to place a name on this chap.

In fact, however, we do know the identity of a close friend (and client) of Kirk Lyons—just like Andreas Strassmeir—who was then (and remains today) active—in a markedly influential but still notably “behind the scenes” fashion—in the white separatist movement. And it just so happens that this individual (at that time) was “mid-40-ish” and known to drive a hot red Fiero sports car.

And it is also known that—at the very time when *The Spotlight* was publicizing and seeking to identify McVeigh’s friend with the red sports car—the Lyons client in question put his own sports car up for sale, after having painted it over with gold, a process that automotive paint experts say is not only difficult but expensive.

The editorial staff of *The Spotlight* came to conclude—based on the Lyons-Strassmeir connection to McVeigh and the Oklahoma affair—that this red sports car driving individual was indeed Lyons’ other friend and client, but never reported the name due to certain legal considerations, too complicated to explain here.

But suffice it to say that, long after the Oklahoma bombing, on July 12, 2002, a major Philippine government, *The Manila Times*, published an odd article which said in part:

United States intelligence officials have released the names of 25 international terrorist suspects believed to have slipped in and out of the Philippines in the last four years . . .

Little is known about the names on the list. American sources said the individuals on the list come from different organizations and additional information could jeopardize ongoing investigations.

But at least one man, the German Andreas Strassmeir, has been linked to the April 19, 1995 bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City.

The Philippine newspaper published the list of the 25 names (most of which names were unknown to those of us who had monitored the matter.) However, the name of the Lyons associate—whom we believed to be McVeigh's friend with the red sports car associated—was on that list, along with Strassmeir.

In some respects the fact that this particular individual popped up in this way was no surprise, inasmuch as we had long ago concluded that this individual was, in fact, someone with some rather unusual connections in what might be called the highest (and lowest) realms. However, at the same time, it was a disturbing (even eerie) underscoring of our suspicions.

And considering the fact this individual's name had never before been linked *publicly* to Strassmeir or to published data relating to Oklahoma bombing, it was remarkable, to say the very least, that his name appeared (linked to terrorism) in a Filipino newspaper.

Our international efforts—via the resources of *American Free Press* (successor to *The Spotlight*)—to track down the author of the *Manila Times* article were unsuccessful.

And the red sports car suspect in question seemed to express genuine surprise (when contacted) when he learned that his name had been published in the Filipino journal. He denied ever having traveled to the Philippines, but was, naturally, unable to actually deny with certainty that his identity had ever been used in some way by someone else involved in some international intrigues.

The mystery of the individual with the red sports car will probably never be resolved, but it points further to the global web of intrigue connected to Andreas Strassmeir, his friend and attorney Kirk Lyons and

groups such as the Southern Poverty Law Center and the Anti-Defamation League—not to mention the Mossad—that have swirled around dissident political movements in America.

Then, as now, they were using their considerable resources and influence to manipulate individuals and organizations and on April 19, 1993 all of it came together in Oklahoma City.

There is much, much more to the ugly “story behind the story” of the Oklahoma City bombing and in the pages that follow we will explore all of this further.

In his book *Others Unknown* McVeigh’s defense lawyer, Stephen Jones, noted that, at the very beginning, when he met with Susan Otto—the public defender who initially handled McVeigh’s case before Jones came aboard—she had told him to prepare himself, saying, “When you know everything I know, Stephen, and you will soon enough, you will never think of the United States of America again in the same way.”

And for this own part, Jones said, “the Oklahoma City bombing conspiracy may not merely be the crime itself but also the systematic, deliberate attempt of our federal government to prevent all of us from finding out what exactly happened on that terrible April morning.”

All of those are strong words from two different lawyers who have no reason to make such extraordinary pronouncements. One of them actually worked for the federal government at the time and Jones had a long and distinguished career moving in high government circles, even including service as a ranking staffer on Capitol Hill in Washington.

Neither of these attorneys can be considered “anti-government extremists,” but they certainly had considerable doubts about the U.S. government’s role in the circumstances surrounding the investigation—or rather, the cover-up—of the Oklahoma bombing.

Moving forward, however, we will see that the template for terror that was set in place and which led to the Oklahoma tragedy was clearly not strictly American in origin, but, in many ways, cruelly manipulated and misled many Americans—including even good people in government service—in a variety of insidious ways.

In some respects, it may not even be too far off to conclude that the American government—for whatever its reasons—may have actually done the American people a service in covering up at least certain aspects of the Oklahoma bombing conspiracy, for, in so doing, they may have helped us avoid a foolish and unnecessary foreign war in the Middle East. If only that had been the case after the subsequent false flag provocation remembered as 9-11.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN:

Timothy McVeigh and the ADL: A Clear-Cut Demonstration of Long-Time Mossad Monitoring of the Oklahoma City “Patsy”

Immediately after the Oklahoma City bombing, *The Spotlight* inadvertently—and by a surprising means—came upon solid evidence that the accused bomber, Timothy McVeigh, was in close and probably sustained contact with an agent of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith, and that the ADL had McVeigh under regular surveillance for some time.

Whether that informant was the ubiquitous Andreas Strassmeir, whose own sordid record we've already examined, or someone else, we'll probably never know. But here are the facts which prove that McVeigh and his activities were under the close scrutiny of the ADL.

On April 21, 1995, in an early-morning edition, *The Washington Post* reported—to the surprise of those of us on the staff of *The Spotlight*—that, in the fall of 1993, McVeigh—using the name “T. Tuttle”—had taken out a classified advertisement which had run for four weekly issues in *The Spotlight*, beginning on Aug. 9, 1993.

According to the *Post*, the source of this information was an ADL press release. Needless to say, we at *The Spotlight* were surprised to learn of this story. So when alerted to this allegation our staff underwent a time-consuming effort to locate the advertisement and the related in-house paperwork relating to the advertisement.

However, we soon learned from a friendly source with high-level U.S. and international intelligence contacts—namely former high-ranking CIA official Victor Marchetti (author of the famous work, *The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence*)—that the reason why the ADL knew McVeigh had advertised in *The Spotlight* was because, according to Marchetti's sources, the ADL had an “inside source” in McVeigh's circle.

In the meantime, later that afternoon, *The Spotlight* staff was astounded when the *Post* published a *late-morning* edition of its April 21, 1995, issue and, in reprinting the quite lengthy article about McVeigh, deleted *only* the reference to the ADL's data on McVeigh.

(Now, years later, according to investigators, the first version of that *Post* article seems to have conveniently disappeared from even the official *Post* archives altogether—highly unusual, so they say!)

However, as we began to review the records of *The Spotlight's* advertising department, we soon came to understand why the *Post* had come to the ADL's rescue, covering up the ADL's intimate knowledge about McVeigh when republishing the story.

Although McVeigh had indeed contracted to run the same advertisement in four consecutive issues of *The Spotlight*, the ad did not run the first week (Aug. 9, 1993) it was scheduled. The ad did not actually run until one week later, in the Aug. 16, 1993 issue. Yet, when the ADL had scurried to tip off *The Washington Post*, the ADL reported that the ad had first run in the August 9 issue.

In short, although the ADL knew (through McVeigh or a source close to McVeigh) that McVeigh had contracted to run ads in *The Spotlight* and put that data in its record, the ADL did not know that an in-house scheduling conflict at *The Spotlight* prevented the ad from appearing when it was first scheduled.

Ironically, *The Spotlight's* editor ultimately pulled the ad (which was for a flare gun) because, as he put it, something seemed "suspicious." Consequently the ad never ran as many *times* as the ADL expected and first noted in its surveillance file on McVeigh!

As a consequence, after the bombing, over a year later, when the ADL rushed to *The Washington Post* with "news" about McVeigh's "link" to *The Spotlight*, they mistakenly cited the first scheduled date for the advertisement. However, the ADL obviously quickly discovered (as did *The Spotlight*) that the ADL's data was incorrect and hastily arranged to have the *Post* re-write its initial story. Obviously, the ADL's mistake did point toward its intimate knowledge of McVeigh's advertising deals.

Since the ADL is known to report its findings to agencies such as the FBI, the BATE, the CIA, and Israel's intelligence service, Mossad, is it unreasonable to ask whether any of these agencies also had knowledge of McVeigh's activities—and his intentions?

There is a final point that needs to be mentioned in relation to the interest of the ADL in the affairs of Timothy McVeigh.

Keeping in mind that there had been conflicting reports about the exact time of Timothy McVeigh's arrival in Oklahoma City prior to the bombing—a point the government was eager to suppress—this lends some credence to the theory that there may have actually been a "Tim McVeigh No. 2" (that is, someone masquerading as McVeigh) as part of a wide-ranging conspiracy of which McVeigh was possibly unaware.

Here's one possible answer as to who may have been masquerading as McVeigh: Ten days after the bombing, a "right wing" Israeli terrorist—28-year-old Sharon Svi Toval (also known as Zvi Sharon) —was arrested in New York by U.S. authorities. Then, under escort and airtight security, Toval was deported to Israel.

The one published photograph of Toval that appeared in *The New York Daily News*, on May 3, 1995, shows a young man who—without beard, mustache and yarmulke—could be mistaken by a stranger for

either accused Oklahoma bomber Tim McVeigh or for the person shown in the famous “John Doe No. 1” sketch that authorities released immediately after the bombing and which was used to identify McVeigh.

In light of reports in 1995 that McVeigh’s attorneys were looking into the possibility that “right wing terrorists” from Israel—or even Israel’s intelligence agency, the Mossad itself—had a hand in the bombing, Toval’s specter is intriguing.

Couple that with the obvious “inside” knowledge about McVeigh’s activities by the Mossad-connected ADL and a whole new light is shed on the possibility that this young Israel was acting as a “second McVeigh” (much as there were convincing stories of a “second” or even “third” Lee Harvey Oswald circulating prior to the JFK assassination).

It’s probably no coincidence Toval’s name also appeared on a list of 25 names—published by the Philippine-based *Manila Times* newspaper on July 12, 2002—of reputed terrorists who had been traveling between the United States and the Philippines over a four year period.

That list—referenced earlier in Chapter Twelve—also included not only the name of the Mossad-connected German-born intriguer, Andreas Strassmeir, a foremost figure in the Oklahoma affair, but also the name of another American who was (like Strassmeir) a close friend and client of the ubiquitous white separatist attorney Kirk Lyons.

And there’s one other point worth noting: Although, before his execution, Timothy McVeigh said that he acted alone in delivering a bomb to the Murrah Building on April 19, 1995, McVeigh never revealed the name of the person in Oklahoma City who—on April 17, two days before the bombing—mailed *The Spotlight* what can only be described as a “warning” of the impending bombing.

The existence of this warning laid myth to McVeigh’s claim that no one else—other than Terry Nichols and their friends, Michael and Lori Fortier—knew of the bomb plot.

It also raises two pertinent questions:

1) Did the the ADL—which was clearly monitoring McVeigh—have a hand in putting forth this “warning” or have knowledge of who was responsible for sending it? and

2) Why has the FBI refused to comment publicly about what—if anything—the bureau did to identify the person (or persons) who mailed this warning to *The Spotlight*?

Here’s the story only *The Spotlight* and New York’s *Village Voice* (in its Oct. 1, 1997 issue)—and later *American Free Press*—dared to report.

On April 20, 1995—the day after the OKC bombing—*The Spotlight*’s mail room opened an envelope postmarked “Oklahoma City.” The envelope had been mailed to *The Spotlight* on April 17—two days

before the bombing. It was hand-addressed in script, but we now know that the writing is very clearly not McVeigh's.

Inside the envelope was a postcard featuring a Depression-era photograph depicting a dust storm over Oklahoma. This famous picture is ominously entitled "Black Sunday" (which, incidentally, was also the name of a Hollywood film about terrorism). The postcard also bears the printed legend, "Dust Storm Approaching at 60 mi. per hr. April 14, '35."

Also enclosed alongside the postcard was a photocopy of a twelve-year-old article from *The Spotlight* about the government murder of IRS and Federal Reserve critic Gordon Kahl. There was no name or return address anywhere on the envelope or on any of the contents.

When the staff of *The Spotlight* saw this postcard (just one day after the bombing) they knew something was up and called in *The Spotlight's* attorney, Mark Lane, who immediately turned the original card and envelope over to Attorney General Janet Reno and the FBI.

Although this strange postcard strongly points to foreknowledge (by somebody) about the impending bombing, the FBI subsequently told Lane that they had "lost" the postcard! Fortunately, however, *The Spotlight* had made a copy.

After, during a telephone conversation, I advised James Ridgeway, the well-known columnist for *The Village Voice*, about the postcard, Ridgeway contacted the FBI in April of 1997, but all an FBI spokesman would say was this: "We have not stated anything in regards [sic] to that." (The bad grammar was that of the FBI spokesman.)

Several questions arise:

Why has the FBI "not stated anything in regards to that"?

Whose handwriting is on the envelope?

Are we to conclude it was simply a bizarre coincidence that such an ominous postcard was mailed from Oklahoma City just two days before the bombing?

Or, in the alternative, is it possible that McVeigh himself had no knowledge that this postcard was being mailed to *The Spotlight* and had no part in so doing—that a third party orchestrated the mailing as part of some covert plot to implicate *The Spotlight* in the bombing? (And this, of course, seems likely.)

Had *The Spotlight* thrown the postcard away or if our attorney had not turned the material over to the FBI, there's no doubt what would have happened: The FBI would have been told about the postcard from a "source" and FBI agents would have stormed *The Spotlight's* offices, accusing the staff of "obstructing justice" by destroying evidence, etc.

There's no question that somebody other than Timothy McVeigh addressed this suspicious envelope and mailed the material within to

The Spotlight—two days before the bombing. That person had advance knowledge of the impending bombing and, by enclosing *The Spotlight* article, was implicitly linking the death of Gordon Kahl (and *The Spotlight's* account of his tragic story) to the bombing.

The mystery surrounding this postcard demonstrates, beyond any question, that there's much more to the Oklahoma City bombing than either McVeigh or the FBI is willing to admit.

What motivated McVeigh in not telling the entire story is open to speculation.

By the same token, that the FBI is refusing to talk about this postcard only adds fuel to the continuing doubts about what really happened in Oklahoma City.

The bottom line is that the FBI and the ADL knew much more about the Oklahoma City bombing than they would admit, and no doubt for very good reason:

Exposure of the truth would demonstrate, beyond any question, that the ADL's foreign principal—the Mossad—was ultimately responsible for what happened in Oklahoma City on the tragic day.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN:

“The Arabs Did It”— Neo-Conservative Zionist Propaganda Regarding the Oklahoma City Bombing

In the spring of 2004—supported by major pro-Zionist elements in the media monopoly—high-level figures from the pro-Israel neo-conservative network began promoting a book claiming Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein had been behind the Oklahoma bombing and that reputed Islamic terrorist Ramzi Yousef—a purported operative of Al-Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden—was a key player in the affair.

The theory that the two Arab leaders, Saddam and bin Laden, were involved in a highly unlikely alliance to blow up the Murrah Building and blame it on American “lily white” patsies came at precisely the time when the neo-conservatives were struggling to explain the utter failure of the U.S. war in Iraq. The “Saddam Bombed Oklahoma City” crowd touted this theory as another justification for a war that, as most Americans now know, was based on a patchwork of horrendous lies.

The neo-conservative promotion of *The Third Terrorist*, by former Oklahoma City television journalist Jayna Davis, was an after-the-fact means to justify the misdeeds and misinformation by the neo-conservatives and their allies in Israel who helped bring the war about.

Former CIA Director James Woolsey and Frank Gaffney (a longtime colleague of neo-conservative intriguer Richard Perle, once investigated by the FBI for espionage on behalf of Israel) were just two of the neo-conservatives who lent their names to promoting the new book.

In the meantime, *U.S. News & World Report*, published by pro-Israel ideologue Mort Zuckerman, former chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, along with Fox News (owned by pro-Israel billionaire Rupert Murdoch) also joined the chorus promoting the book.

For its part, *The Wall Street Journal* not only hyped Davis’s claim of Saddam’s involvement in the Oklahoma affair but even conjoined it with the conspiracy theory concocted by neo-conservative Laurie Mylroie who asserts Saddam was also behind the first attack on the World Trade Center in 1993.

In addition, *Vanity Fair*—published by pro-Israel media titan S. I. Newhouse—offered a friendly profile of Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz noting that a “longtime friend” of Wolfowitz (probably the aforementioned Perle) says Wolfowitz has long believed Saddam was behind the Oklahoma tragedy.

Of particular interest is the background of the chief sponsor of *The Third Terrorist*: WND Books, an enterprise of Joseph Farah, editor of Internet-based World Net Daily. Not only has Farah long operated in the

sphere of billionaire Richard Scaife—whose CIA-connected intrigues go back decades—but in 2003 Farah was honored as “journalist of the year” by the Zionist Organization of America, one of the most vociferous advocates of the war against Saddam. Although an Arab-American, Farah is a fervent supporter of Israel and hardly an unbiased source.

Now about the book . . .

Jayna Davis presented a convincing case that Tim McVeigh was traveling with at least one—and likely more—Iraqi nationals (based in Oklahoma City) in the minutes, days, weeks and months leading up to the disaster.

And—although she never mentions it—it was the now-defunct *Spotlight* that most consistently gave attention to Davis’ investigation, even while “mainstream” news sources studiously ignored her work.

However, obviously, as we have seen, that changed.

But to those who carefully reviewed *The Spotlight’s* reportage on Davis, none of this comes as any surprise, for—as *The Spotlight* said early on—so-called evidence of “Iraqi” involvement actually pointed elsewhere: that is, toward the likelihood that elements operating inside the U.S. (and manipulating McVeigh)—and we do mean the Mossad—were setting the stage for a terrorist attack that could be falsely blamed on Saddam for the purpose of stoking up a war against the Iraqi strongman—a war that finally came in the spring of 2003 (but, of course, only in the aftermath of the 9-11 tragedy).

Although Davis does seem to believe there was a Middle East connection—*of Arab or Muslim origin*—behind the bombing, there were many serious problems with her book. First of all, Davis completely disregarded the following critical evidence:

- Eyewitness testimony by bombing survivor Jane Graham, who—a day or so prior to the bombing—spotted a group of mysterious figures engaged in activity which suggests they were placing explosives inside the Murrah Building; these men were not Arabs, but white Americans and definitely neither McVeigh nor his co-conspirator Terry Nichols;

- Testimony by multiple survivors who insist there was a major blast inside the Murrah Building following the explosion of the “McVeigh truck bomb” outside on the street;

- Seismographic data indicating more than one blast at the time of the disaster; and

- While multiple news reports—from a wide array of sources—indicated other unexploded bombs had been found inside the Murrah Building after the explosion, Davis stated flatly that these bomb scares “proved innocuous.” Certainly no other bombs exploded, but their existence hardly makes them “innocuous.”

- Although Davis referenced the heroics of Oklahoma City policeman Terrence Yeakey—almost gratuitously—she never mentioned that Yeakey’s purported suicide is deemed “murder” by his friends and family who believe, based on Yeakey’s remarks at the time, that he witnessed something either before or after the bombing that led him to believe the authorities were covering up the truth about what really happened.

- Most notably, Davis never once referenced the intrigues of Hebrew-speaking Mossad-connected former German military intelligence officer Andreas Strassmeir whose checkered background—and that description might be termed “innocuous,” to say the least—points toward directions that Davis (and those promoting her book) would certainly prefer not to go.

So, although, of course, it was not Davis’ intent to explore all of the mysteries surrounding the bombing, it was disconcerting that she ignored some of the more notable questions that arose in its wake. Her focus was the purported “Iraqi connection” but even in that regard she actually left more questions unanswered than answered.

In fact, Davis’s book was simply looking at a small part of a much larger picture and ignoring relevant details that—taken together in their entirety—point in another direction entirely and that is the role of the Mossad in orchestrating the Oklahoma bombing tragedy.

Davis never adequately explained why the FBI—under either Bill Clinton or George W. Bush—would be so eager to suppress evidence that Saddam Hussein and/or “Islamic” or “Arabic” militants working with Saddam or in his sphere of influence had been involved in the Oklahoma tragedy.

Her best—albeit quite lame—explanation was the excuse that the Democratic Clinton administration (in power at the time of the bombing) did not want to admit that it ignored “warnings” of a possible attack put forth by a Republican Party-associated operative on Capitol Hill, Israeli-born “terrorism expert” Yosef Bodansky, who just happened to be one of Davis’s key sources.

Davis made the assertion that Democrats in the Clinton administration would have been inclined to dismiss Bodansky’s warnings as “Zionist propaganda.”

In fact, in one respect, there may be some grain of truth to this, but in a quite different way than Davis suggested.

There is no question that—as *Davis herself admitted*—Israeli operatives landed in Oklahoma City immediately after the bombing and began promoting the theory that, as one of Davis’s Israeli sources put it, “the bomb which destroyed the Murrah Building was constructed by Arab terrorists or people trained by Arab terrorists.”

But what Davis never explored (or never mentioned, for it would not fit with her theory) is the possibility that the Clinton administration had no desire to crank up a war against Saddam, recognizing that the Israeli propaganda claim that Saddam was behind the bombing was part of the long-standing Zionist drive to topple the Iraqi leader.

In one instance Davis pointed out that a Senate staffer told her she was known as "the baby with the loaded gun." The fear was, he said, that "they don't know where you are going to point it next."

Although Davis evidently never considered it, one could read into this remark that Davis's dogged inquiries *were* going a bit *too* far. In other words, if Davis started digging too deeply into the "Iraqi connection" she could discover something quite the opposite: That the Iraqi connection was another Israeli "false flag" designed to shift the blame for a covert operation carried out by Israeli intelligence.

So although Davis painted a fairly convincing picture that an Iraqi immigrant, Hussain Al-Hussaini, was in league with McVeigh in the Oklahoma bombing, her book is unclear in explaining whether she believes it was Saddam's sworn enemy, Islamic fundamentalist Osama bin Laden or Iraq's secular Arab ruler Saddam (who actively suppressed Islamic fundamentalists) who was the ultimate sponsor of Al-Hussaini.

Instead, Davis weaved a tangled story that links Osama and Saddam in an unlikely scenario that never precisely pinpoints the finger of blame—a rather important detail missed by those eager to accept her thesis. A *discerning* reader will note this immediately, but most readers are not that discerning, a point arguing in favor of the likelihood that many will—regrettably—take Davis's book seriously. ("Arab plots" *are* popular in the media these days.)

At one point, she does state that "it really is a foreign conspiracy masterminded and funded by Osama bin Laden, according to my intelligence sources," but this flat-out charge is refuted by other claims she made elsewhere regarding Al-Hussaini having "possibly" (her word) been "a devoted member of Saddam Hussein's prized military unit, the Republican Guard," (and therefore an agent of Saddam—not bin Laden).

When Davis begins to explore the purported link of the mysterious Ramzi Yousef to the Oklahoma affair is when her theory really begins to unravel. For here, she is treading on shaky ground, attempting to tie an alleged Islamic fundamentalist (ostensibly under the discipline of bin Laden's Al-Qaeda network) to an agent of Saddam Hussein—the Iraqi leader whom bin Laden himself had vowed to destroy.

And there are real questions about just whom Yousef and his uncle, Khalid Shaikh Mohammed (said to be Al-Qaeda's chief of operations) were *really* working for.

And as we shall see later, in more detail, in these pages, evidence first published by Jewish-American journalist Robert I. Friedman in New York's *Village Voice* indicates Yousef was working closely with an Israeli mole inside the conspiracy behind the 1993 attack on the World Trade Center (WTC), forerunner of the September 11, 2001 tragedy.

So when Davis asserted that "the terrorist who engineered the delivery of a Ryder truck packed with a powerful fertilizer-fuel oil bomb to America's financial district likely orchestrated a similarly executed bombing in Oklahoma City," she was suggesting—unwittingly, to be sure—that the Mossad also had a hand in Oklahoma as it did in the 1993 WTC attack! But don't expect Davis or her promoters to say that.

All of this is not to suggest Davis was *deliberately* purveying lies. However, driven by a desire to bring her story to the fore—a story based on deliberate false flag disinformation that was planted for the very purpose of being brought to Davis's attention in the first place—Davis *was* being manipulated and that she did not understand the more subtle intricacies of the world of intrigue that were surrounding her.

However, other forces were also promoting the theme that there was a "Middle East connection" to the bombing—that Tim McVeigh was being handled by "the Arabs" or "the Muslims" and that ultimately, Saddam Hussein and/or Osama bin Laden were behind the bombing. In fact, elements in what is known as "the patriot movement" were promoting this Zionist propaganda and continue to do so to this day.

Some of those "patriots" hyping the alleged "Middle East connection" were on the payroll of *Media Bypass*, a magazine that popped up shortly before the bombing and which so quickly achieved such a gigantic circulation boost—50,000 readers virtually overnight—that it was generally assumed by informed observers that *somebody somewhere was subsidizing Media Bypass for the purpose of directing (or, rather, misdirecting) the patriot movement.*

Not coincidentally, a key figure at *Media Bypass* was a shadowy figure—calling himself "Lawrence Myers"—known to have long-standing high-level intelligence connections. Then when its handlers were done utilizing *Media Bypass* for their own purposes, they pulled the plug and sold the magazine (which quickly folded without the previous big money backing). *However, some of the original operatives from Media Bypass still engage in intrigues inside the patriot movement today.*

To sum it up: There were many efforts to redirect attention toward "false flags" set in place by the real conspirators behind the Oklahoma bombing. And in our next chapter, we'll put it all in place and examine how those false flags fit into the template for terror that we first saw in the JFK assassination and which Israel utilized again in Oklahoma.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN:

What Really Happened in Oklahoma City? A Familiar Template for Terror and a Scenario That Does Make Sense

Let us note, at the outset, that what follows in this chapter is obviously speculative in nature. However, it is based upon a long-term review of a wide variety of published information put together by many different independent Oklahoma City bombing investigators, not to mention an assortment of facts and statements put forth by official investigators.

And it should be added that even within the ranks of those who have been investigating the OKC bombing, there is a great range of differing opinion as to precisely what happened on that tragic day.

While most of the varying theories intersect at many points, and, in the end, are hardly different, it must be noted here—and this is no surprise—that many of the supposedly “independent” investigators deliberately ignore uncomfortable facts that would suggest the conspiracy led in directions they would prefer to avoid following.

And we do mean, of course, the possibility of an Israeli connection to the Oklahoma City tragedy.

And even many of those who have been heard to mutter about a “Middle East connection” (meaning, of course, that “the Arabs” or “the Muslims” were behind the Oklahoma) are never prepared to acknowledge the likelihood that those Arabs on the ground on Oklahoma City who have been linked to the conspiracy may, in fact, have been acting as “false flags” for Israel’s Mossad.

So what of the various theories? Let’s review them and attempt to delineate, as simply as possible, the main points of each..

Some hold that it was a “U.S. government operation” deliberately designed to destroy the Murrah Building and place blame upon “right wing militias” for the purpose of setting in place police-state measures ultimately designed to impose martial law on the United States and thereby dissolve our Constitutional republic.

Many promoters of this scenario suggest that the orders “came from the top”—that is, that President Bill Clinton and his top advisors were “in on it,” acting perhaps as proxies for favorite villains such as “the Illuminati” or the Council on Foreign Relations or some other shadowy international power bloc. This is the simplistic version that disregards some of the more down to earth details that we’ll explore shortly.

While some contend that McVeigh was simply a “patsy”—perhaps brainwashed and under mind control—others suggest that McVeigh was a knowing agent of higher-ranking behind-the-scenes conspirators, that he was part of a secret government team staging acts of terrorism.

Others contend McVeigh was “for real”—that he was actively conspiring to blow up the federal building on his own (along with a handful of other extremists, known and unknown) and that government authorities allowed the conspiracy to go forward, again for the purpose of clamping down on the militias and setting in place a police state as part of a grand design for a New World Order.

In contrast, there are those who say that while the government was aware of McVeigh’s plans, a federal sting operation (perhaps by the BATF) designed to stop—and expose—McVeigh and his collaborators went awry; that the bomb went off and destroyed the Murrah Building and that the government agents who failed to prevent the tragedy from happening were thus forced into a cover-up mode.

This thesis is based on the theme that the BATF was smarting under public scrutiny as a result of the debacle at Waco with the Branch Davidian church and that the BATF was trying to show how valuable its efforts were in fighting “extremism” of the type of which McVeigh was found guilty. However, of course, according to this theory, the BATF bungled and the bombing took place.

Generally, this thesis contends that McVeigh was “for real,” so to speak, but that government bungling allowed the tragedy to happen and that the cover-up by the government was necessary to keep the truth about government incompetence from reaching the public.

That’s a “comfortable” scenario for many, many people.

Another variation on one or more of the above versions of “what happened” is that McVeigh and his co-conspirators were planning to set off a bomb in front of the Murrah Building, but that others—generally said to be “government agents”—also put bombs inside the building and made sure there was a massive loss of life and major destruction. This thesis is founded on the reasonable contention that only government agents would have the kind of access to the Murrah Building (a federal facility) in order to make such a scenario possible.

And then, of course, there are those who say that either Saddam Hussein or Osama bin Laden (or both working together) were responsible for what happened in Oklahoma City. This scenario, obviously, is the least likely but it is this thesis that has received the most widespread publicity (from the pro-Zionist media in America) other than that accorded the official claim that McVeigh was effectively, a “lone nut” (with the exception of peripheral involvement by Terry Nichols, and possible foreknowledge by his friends Michael and Lori Fortier).

In the end, however, there is one scenario which, in its entirety, ties many of these threads together in a way that does make sense. And that is the scenario—the template for terror—we outline here.

Our Oklahoma City bombing scenario follows: Timothy McVeigh was a young man—an ex-Army combat veteran—with leanings toward the philosophy of the “right wing” and the militia movement. And as we noted earlier, McVeigh’s former federal prison associate, David Paul Hammer has said that McVeigh told Hammer that he had been recruited into a secret intelligence unit to infiltrate the militias and report back on their activities, although McVeigh was indeed sympathetic to the philosophy of the militia groups he was monitoring.

McVeigh himself—if sympathetic to the militias, as many believe, based on what are purported to be McVeigh’s own writings and statements—was probably told that he was acting on behalf of higher-ups in the government or in the military who were sympathetic to the militias, seeing them as a possible ally in some ultimate fight against the dreaded “New World Order.”

In this part of the scenario, McVeigh may have believed, as a consequence, that he was not acting as a “rat” or as an informant but was, instead, working to help the militia movement by acting as a liaison between the movement and its purported sympathizers inside the federal military or law enforcement apparatus.

There is also the possibility that as an aspect of his recruitment and training, as part of some clandestine operation, McVeigh was subjected—even at this early stage—to some form of programming or mind-control of which he may not have been aware.

However, it is entirely possible that the unit (or entity) that recruited McVeigh was *not* an officially-sanctioned U.S. government operation *per se*, and was, instead, a “rogue” operation under the thumb of a genuine militia sympathizer within U.S. military and intelligence circles.

But there is another possibility and that is that this operation (which had enough earmarks to convince McVeigh it was U.S.-government sponsored) may not have even been a U.S. government operation at all. *Instead, it could have been a totally spurious operation, set up on American shores by Israel’s Mossad.*

This Mossad operation could have been utilizing home-grown American assets who were—either knowingly or unknowingly—working on behalf of Israeli intelligence.

In other words, if the unit was U.S.-government sponsored (or even if it was some sort of “rogue” operation under the control of very real militia sympathizers with military and intelligence connections) McVeigh’s immediate supervisors may have been hoodwinked by the Mossad and may have never suspected it; that is, this secret unit may have been actually created by—or was otherwise co-opted by—the Mossad and was being used to recruit McVeigh and other individuals.

In recent years we have learned that even the otherwise pro-Israel George W. Bush administration was outraged to learn that Mossad operatives had masqueraded at various times in various places as agents of the FBI and the CIA (and presumably other U.S. agencies) in order to carry out ventures that were exclusively part of the Israeli agenda.

So the possibility that the Mossad did set up some phony intelligence unit on American shores (or otherwise directed—or misdirected and manipulated—a genuine such operation) is not beyond the pale.

Although we're talking about layer upon layer of intrigue, it is all actually rather simple in its set-up, reflecting a template that if fully in line with the Mossad's classic use of "false flags" and false identities in pursuit of its historically insidious games of intrigue.

McVeigh's assignment to infiltrate the militias was part of a calculated effort to place McVeigh in the position of being—in the public perception—precisely the type of "right wing militia" activist that he (McVeigh) believed he was monitoring for his superiors (who had a covert agenda kept well hidden from McVeigh).

With all of this in place, Timothy McVeigh began moving in militia circles, making contact with seemingly like-minded individuals. And in short order, as we have seen, McVeigh's activities were clearly being monitored, at least in part, by the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith, a most efficient arm of the Mossad.

And, needless to say, all of this recalls intrigues (described earlier) that surrounded Lee Harvey Oswald preceding the JFK assassination: Namely, Mossad manipulation of both anti-Castro Cuban elements and intelligence operations within the CIA itself, utilizing knowing assets (such as high-ranking CIA official James Angleton) as well as figures such as E. Howard Hunt, for example, who appears to have been caught in the middle, not knowing that an assassination was in the offing.

It was in the course of his assignment that McVeigh found among his new associates an enigmatic individual by the name of Andreas Strassmeir, who, as we have seen had quite stellar military and intelligence connections here and abroad—including to Israel's Mossad.

All of this is hardly, as we've noted, the profile of your run-of-the-mill "neo-Nazi" or "white separatist" agitator.

There was obviously much more to Strassmeir and his close friend and attorney, Kirk Lyons—as well Lyons' associate, Dave Holloway, a former CIA pilot—than they would have us believe.

It is not beyond the realm of possibility that Strassmeir was, in fact, an outright asset of Israel's Mossad being deployed by the Mossad into the ranks of the American intelligence community through his contacts in German intelligence. Things do work that way.

In any case, as we know, Strassmeir and the denizens of Elohim City—the now-infamous “Christian Identity” compound—were under surveillance by at least one division of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, that office which utilized Carol Howe as an informant.

Miss Howe was reporting to her BATF handlers, describing talk by Strassmeir of attacking U.S. federal buildings. However, in the end, of course, the U.S. government did all in its power to dismiss Miss Howe’s claims regarding Strassmeir despite the fact the record is clear she had made her claims about Strassmeir well before the bombing took place.

Thus, it seems, one band of the U.S. government intelligence apparatus (that directing Miss Howe) was perhaps unaware of the other band directing the activities of Strassmeir (and McVeigh)..

This would not be the first time that such a thing happened. At the very time one division of the CIA was utilizing and funding informants inside the anti-Vietnam War movement, other CIA divisions and the FBI were spending millions of dollars to combat the anti-war movement.

For his part—citing his own “very reliable source” whom British journalist Ambrose Evans-Pritchard believed to be Strassmeir himself—Strassmeir told Evans-Pritchard: “The different agencies weren’t cooperating. In fact, they were working against each other. You even had a situation where one branch of the FBI was investigating and not sharing anything with another branch of the FBI.”

And all of this does not preclude the possibility—the likelihood—that some domestic government elements involved in manipulating McVeigh were also working hand-in-glove (*knowingly or unknowingly*) with a foreign intelligence network, namely that of Israel.

And here, again, of course, we come back to Strassmeir who was almost certainly a witting asset of the Mossad, whatever his relationship to any specific government agency or to a “private” intelligence operation such as the Southern Poverty Law Center.

As we noted earlier, longtime ADL informant Roy Bullock variously worked for the ADL along with the FBI and the Indianapolis Police Department—not to mention, at one point, the intelligence agency of the apartheid regime of South Africa. So the possibility Strassmeir was wearing various hats—and some of them perhaps unknown to elements inside the U.S. government—is not beyond the realm of possibility.

And while there are many foreign intelligence agencies that do monitor and infiltrate domestic American “right wing” circles, Israel, of course, is that one foreign nation with a distinct special interest, so to speak, in the particular circles (often anti-Jewish or otherwise anti-Zionist) in which Strassmeir and his handler, Kirk Lyons and, of course, Timothy McVeigh were operating.

And, for the record, of course, since Strassmeir was a German national—with longtime involvement in German military and intelligence circles—we would be remiss in not pointing out that the modern-day German government, likewise, has long had an interest in monitoring American “right wing” circles, particularly those with perceived sympathy for the long-gone Third Reich.

But even when Strassmeir was involved with German intelligence, as we have seen, he was also working with the Israelis, to the point that he even had an Israeli girlfriend and learned to speak Hebrew.

In the meantime we must add to this already complex mix the evidence indicating that there *were* also foreign-born Arabs—at least one, and maybe more—involved with McVeigh in the weeks prior to the bombing. And, as we’ve seen, this “Arab connection” does point toward the likelihood of Mossad involvement.

Based upon a wide variety of information coming from multiple sources, it seems likely that Timothy McVeigh was quite cognizant of a plan—and participated in a venture—that involved the placement of a truck bomb outside the Murrah Building in Oklahoma City.

Whether McVeigh actually exploded that bomb himself or even thought that the bomb would actually be exploded is something that we can never really be certain about.

McVeigh’s public claims—to his official biographers—don’t jibe, in many respects, with what he privately told his friends in prison or even with a lot of the evidence uncovered by his own attorneys. So McVeigh is more than a mystery, in and of himself.

For his part, citing his own aforementioned “very reliable source,” Andreas Strassmeir told British journalist Ambrose Evans-Pritchard that “McVeigh knew he was delivering a bomb, but he had no idea what was in that truck. . . . The bomb was never meant to explode. They were going to arrest McVeigh at the site with the bomb in hand, but he didn’t come at the right time.”

But other conspirators—skilled experts—had already rigged the Murrah Building with explosives inside the structure that were guaranteed to do much more damage than the truck bomb which McVeigh placed outside the building. Some information suggests McVeigh may have known of the explosives inside the building.

And while there appear to have been elements inside the U.S. intelligence agencies (specifically the BATF) who may have attempted to thwart McVeigh’s plans—or, in the alternative, who were actually utilizing McVeigh (and/or his associates) in what has been called “a bungled sting operation”—they clearly failed.

Andreas Strassmeir—who obviously had inside knowledge of what did happen—told Evans-Pritchard that the BATF “had something going with McVeigh. They were watching him—of course they were.

“What they should have done,” said Strassmeir, “is make an arrest while the bomb was still being made instead of waiting till the last moment for a publicity stunt.”

Strassmeir insisted to Evans-Pritchard that it was “obvious that it was a government ‘op’ that went wrong.”

But was it?

The failure to stop the bombing *could* have been the consequence of classic government incompetence.

However, based on the entirety of what we do know about all of the circumstances surrounding the bombing (and the players involved), it is our contention here that—in a more sinister and more likely scenario—those who might have stopped the bombing failed to do so, precisely because they themselves were thwarted by colleagues who were witting (or unwitting accomplices) of “higher forces”—and I do mean the Mossad—that were monitoring these domestic agencies and piggy-backing on their intended “sting” to bring about a very real bombing.

This scenario, of course, recalls the “dummy assassination” in Dealey Plaza on November 22, 1963 that became “the real thing.”

As we’ve seen, however, there is enough evidence to suggest that the so-called “international connections” to the Oklahoma City bombing do not point toward Saddam Hussein or Osama bin Laden, either working together or independently.

Instead, all of the evidence points to Israel.

Ultimately, of course, the Mossad hoped to use the bombing to “wake up the American people” to the “dangers” posed by Saddam Hussein and force the Clinton administration to wage war against Iraq—and the rest of the Muslim world. But, as we know, Clinton chose to go in another direction.

And, what’s more, as a consequence of the fact that myriad U.S. government agencies—including the BATF, the FBI, the CIA and probably others—had been tuned in to McVeigh’s activities (and also those of Andreas Strassmeir) long before the bombing, this put the government in a critically necessary cover-up mode that led to the ultimate “lone bomber” scenario that became the official U.S. government line.

What is outlined here regarding the Oklahoma City tragedy is the most likely over-all scenario of how the bombing conspiracy unfolded, a conspiracy that employed almost precisely the same model used in the public execution of John F. Kennedy.

The bottom line is this: The Oklahoma bombing *can* ultimately be attributed to Israel. There is nothing—*absolutely nothing* (other than hysterical screams of “anti-Semitism”)—to refute this scenario of Israeli involvement in the Oklahoma bombing.

The fact remains that most honest independent investigators now concede that Andreas Strassmeir was, *at the very least*, an undercover informant for the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) and that American law enforcement officials were aware of this.

Other independent investigators are even willing to concede Strassmeir may have even been working for the CIA or a foreign intelligence agency—that of the German government. However, very few “patriot” investigators will explore Strassmeir’s Mossad connections.

This reticence remains despite—*or perhaps precisely because of*—the fact that it is common knowledge Israeli intelligence has long had considerable influence at wide-ranging levels inside American law enforcement and intelligence, and has effectively utilized as its assets such domestic spying operations as the ADL and the SPLC.

As such, the independent investigators prefer to avoid the Israeli connection altogether. At best, they’ll declaim against the Southern Poverty Law Center as being a “liberal” organization.

In the end, the irony about the fact so many of these investigators are terrified of mentioning *even the possibility* of an Israeli connection to the bombing is that by just putting forth “alternative” theories of “what really happened” they’ve already put themselves in the position of being “monitored” by the ADL, the SPLC, the FBI, the BATE, the CIA and every entity that keeps an eye on those who dare to question the official U.S. government scenario about Oklahoma City or anything relating to other controversial events such as the JFK assassination and 9-11.

Despite repeated efforts—from the beginning—to lay a trail of evidence linking the Oklahoma City tragedy to Saddam Hussein or Osama bin Laden—all of this the work of Israel and those in its sphere of influence—there was enough resistance inside the U.S. government such that the result was that this Israeli scheme to spark a U.S. military reaction was stopped dead in its tracks.

However, on September 11, 2001—we believe—Israel accomplished (on a far grander scale) what it had previously tried, and failed, in Oklahoma City: Orchestrating a shocking terrorist event on American soil, blaming it on “the Arabs” and setting the stage for U.S. military intervention in the Middle East.

We will now review that scenario.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN:

“The Big Winner Today is Israel . . .”

Like millions of other Americans, my first reaction on the morning of September 11, 2001, upon learning of the events that were taking place in New York City and at the Pentagon—just a few miles from my home on Capitol Hill in Washington—was to “reach out and touch someone.” So I called my brother at his home in Pennsylvania—not far, in fact, from the location of where United Airlines Flight 93 was soon to come to an untidy end.

My sister-in-law answered the phone and I blurted out what was foremost in my mind. “Well,” I said, “they did it.”

At this juncture I was assuming that Arab or Muslim terrorists fed up with U.S. favoritism toward Israel were responsible for the attacks.

I was suggesting to my sister-in-law that it was essentially the fault of the Israelis—and their powerful lobby in America—that the tragedy had happened. Had it not been for U.S. policy, I was asserting implicitly, the attacks would never have taken place.

However, my sister-in-law didn’t read my comments that way.

She responded, laughing, and said, “Oh, you think the Jews did this?”

Knowing that, for many years, I had been considered a somewhat “notorious” critic of Israel and of the Jewish lobby in America, my sister-in-law was assuming, perhaps, the worst—or rather, the most likely.

And it was then that it hit me.

What my sister-in-law had *presumed* were my suspicions was precisely what I *did* believe, although, until that moment—surprisingly, in retrospect—I hadn’t realized it myself.

And I responded, “No, what I meant was that America’s all-out pro-Israel policies resulted in a backlash by the Arabs and that Arab terrorists did this. But”—I added—“the more I think about it, I *do* believe that Israel is behind this.

“They did this to turn America against the Arab world. This is precisely the kind of thing Israel *would* do,” I said. “And mark my words, there *will* be evidence that Israel was behind it, even if they cover it up, just as they did with the Kennedy assassination.”

I will remember that conversation for the rest of my life.

But at the time—despite my knowledge of the corruption of the government and the media and of the mendacity and wickedness of Israel and its lobby in America—I never realized how absolutely right I would turn out to be.

So it was that I closed that prophetic conversation with my sister-in-law and—along with the rest of my colleagues at the Capitol Hill office of *American Free Press*—I was glued to television and radio for

the rest of the afternoon—with an occasional glance at the Internet—watching . . . and waiting, wondering what was to come next. Certainly, the whole world was watching.

I heard local news reports about a car bomb exploding near the Pentagon. Now, today, the official story is that “it was only a rumor.”

And I heard the local news reports describing a fire at the Old Executive Office Building, next to the White House. Today, again, that’s just “another rumor.”

It seems that everything and anything that didn’t ultimately match the official version of events was a “rumor”—more often than not, they said, “a rumor from the Muslim world.”

What was not a rumor from the Muslim world, however, was an article lying on my desk that I had clipped from *The Washington Times* on September 10, just one day before.

The front page story in the *Times* revealed that top U.S. Army analysts believed that the Mossad was “ruthless and cunning, “a wildcard” that “has [the] capability to target U.S. forces and make it look like a Palestinian/Arab act.”

The *Times* reported that this explosive and highly revealing assertion appeared in a 68-page paper prepared by sixty officers at the United States Army’s School of Advanced Military Studies (SAMS), a Fort Leavenworth-based training ground for up-and-coming Army officers. The Army paper called Israel’s armed forces a “500 pound gorilla” that is “known to disregard international law to accomplish [its] mission.”

The negative comments about Israel appeared in a SAMS paper putting forth a plan for enforcing an Israeli-Palestinian peace accord requiring an international peace-keeping force of some 20,000 troops stationed in Israel and in a newly-created Palestinian state.

That the SAMS proposal factored in the existence of a Palestinian state was actually an affront by the American Army officers to Israel, which has never fully accepted the idea of a Palestinian state.

In light of the suggestion by U.S. Army officers that Israel might attempt to disrupt U.S. and international peacekeeping efforts in the Middle East and disguise the crimes as those of Palestinian or Arab forces, the events of September 11, 2001—one day after *The Washington Times* reported this story—take on a new light.

With all of this mind, following my conversation with my sister-in-law, I pondered the possibility—in my mind, a likelihood—that the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington were a false flag originating from Israel. And, like many people were doing, I turned to the Internet. I started doing Google searches pairing such terms as “Israel” and “terrorism” with key words connected to the events of that day.

And as a consequence, I stumbled upon an internet website (stratfor.com) that I'd never seen before but which, I soon realized, was produced by some influential people who had some influential followers. The website was the voice of one George Friedman, a former CIA analyst and a high-priced private consultant considered an “authority” on the subjects about which he and his colleagues—a bevy of former intelligence and diplomatic figures—aired their opinions on a steady basis.

What Friedman said on 9-11, only hours after the attack on the World Trade Center, provided an absolute underscoring of my own thesis that Israel was ultimately behind the events that had taken place that day. Friedman wrote in no uncertain terms:

The big winner today, intended or not, is the state of Israel. Israel has been under siege by suicide bombers for more than a year. It has responded by waging a systematic war against Palestinian command structures. The international community, particularly the United States, has pressured Israel heavily to stop its operations. The argument has been made that the threat of suicide bombings, though real, does not itself constitute a genuine threat to Israeli national security and should not trigger the kind of response Israel is making. Today's events change all of this.

“The big winner” Friedman said, was Israel. The events of that day—still unfolding (including not far from me at the Pentagon)—changed everything vis-a-vis U.S. policy toward Israel, he said.

You can imagine my sense of vindication. Here was a Jewish supporter of Israel with substantial credentials in the world of intelligence essentially confirming the very suspicions I had outlined in my conversation with my perhaps a bit-incredulous sister-in-law hardly more than an hour or two before.

Friedman actually seemed to be gloating that now that Americans had been (conveniently, for Israel's interests) victimized by terrorism, that: 1) Americans had now being galvanized against Israel's enemies; 2) that the terrorist acts effectively put the United States in a position in which it could no longer criticize Israel; and that 3) Americans would be forced to be “dependent” on Israel (not vice versa):

First, the United States no longer can argue that Israel should endure the bombings. Moving forward, the domestic American political mood simply won't tolerate such a stance.

Second, Israel now becomes, once again, an indispensable ally to the United States. The United States is obviously going to launch a massive covert and overt war against the international radical Islamic movement that is assumed to be behind this attack.

Not only does this align U.S. and Israeli interests but it also makes the United States dependent on the Israelis—whose intelligence capabilities in this area as well as covert operational capabilities are clearly going to be needed.

What Friedman did not explain was why Israel's vaunted "intelligence capabilities" did not help stop prevent these acts of terrorism from happening in the first place.

In any event, Friedman stated that "There is no question, therefore, that the Israeli leadership is feeling relief." He contended the alleged Muslim terrorists touted in the media as the likely 9-11 terrorists had calculated that their acts would split the Arab world and force Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat to become more accommodating to Israel.

At the time Friedman wrote his remarkable analysis, there was officially "no evidence" as to who was actually behind the attacks—although the major media was already chanting that "the Muslims" (and even Osama bin Laden) were most likely to blame. However, Friedman was already speculating heavily, grinding the axe for not just Islamic terrorists, but for an Islamic state itself. He wrote:

The greatest question right now is this: Which Islamic state was involved in the attack? We suspect that there was such involvement. The sophistication required means of communication and transport available only to states. Afghanistan does not have the international facilities needed. We assume that Sudanese and Iraqi diplomatic communications and transport are both too closely monitored to be useful. If that is true, what other nation provided support facilities for this operation? Answering that question speaks to the future of the region.

Friedman candidly answered the question "Who benefits?" by saying it was Israel. But his question—"What other nation provided support facilities for this operation?" may have been, in the end—in light of what we now know of evidence pointing toward Israeli state sponsorship of the 9-11 tragedy—the most thought-provoking (if ironic) aspect of Friedman's essay, however obviously unintentional it may have been.

So it was—very early on 9-11—that George Friedman was effectively putting in writing—although from an obviously different perspective from my own—the very reasoning that led to my “controversial” assumption as to what really lay behind the 9-11 terrorist attacks.

And needless to say, I made good use of Friedman’s remarks in the days ahead, as I plowed forward, along with my colleagues at *American Free Press*, in trying to bring the real truth about 9-11 to our readers.

And let it be stated without ambiguity: From the beginning, *American Free Press* (AFP) was the one national newspaper countering the 9-11 lies that were being foisted on the American people *and* daring to point the finger of blame in the direction of Israel.

The first issue of AFP published immediately after Sept. 11 (dated Sept. 24) went to the printer on Sept. 14. That issue made it clear our staff was already raising questions about what really happened.

The lead story, by Willis Carto, asked frankly: “Who benefits?” and pointed out that Israel—above all—stood to benefit as a consequence of the United States becoming more embroiled in the Middle East thanks to the likely reverberations from 9-11.

That issue of AFP also featured an article by yours truly, Michael Collins Piper, pointing out there was evidence pointing to Mossad involvement in the first World Trade Center attack in 1993, noting this revelation had first appeared in an article in *The Village Voice* on August 3, 1993 by respected Jewish-American investigative journalist Robert I. Friedman (not to be confused with George Friedman of stratfor.com).

After that first attack on the trade center, I had written an article for *The Spotlight* reflecting on Friedman’s report and yet both *The Spotlight’s* story (and Friedman’s original report) continued to be ignored, even by many so-called “conspiracy theorists.”

And in the wake of 9-11, even many in the “alternative media” who were raising questions about the 9-11 attacks preferred to avoid the possibility of Mossad involvement, studiously refusing to address what Friedman had revealed about the first WTC attack in 1993.

So—at the very outset—AFP broached the No. 1 taboo relating to 9-11, that even many 9-11 dissidents are still hesitant to mention today. AFP was indeed *the* one national media voice—perhaps the one *international* media voice—that said, *from the beginning*, that Israel was certainly the chief suspect in the 9-11 tragedy.

In fact, the second issue of AFP issued in the wake of 9-11 (dated Oct. 1 but printed Sept. 21), featured the front page headline asking the question, “Did Israelis Have Foreknowledge?” That issue of AFP included an article (by yours truly) entitled “U.S. Army Officers Say: ‘Mossad May Blame Arabs,’” which focused on the aforementioned Sept. 10 report (published in *The*

Washington Times) describing the study from the Army's School of Advanced Military Studies which called the Mossad a "wild card" capable of committing a terrorist attack and blaming it on the Arabs.

My article tied the military's assessment to George Friedman's contention that "the big winner" on 9-11 was Israel. The article also reiterated Robert I. Friedman's revelation of the Mossad link to the first World Trade Center attack that I had reported the week before in AFP.

The balance of my article provided an extended overview of the Mossad's historic use of false flags in global terrorism—the details of which now appear in this present book in Chapter One.

Yes, I *was* piling it on—driving home the point that Americans needed to ponder the likelihood Israel had been involved in orchestrating 9-11. In fact, I was one of the first print journalists—if not *the* first and certainly *the first with a wide-reaching audience*—to focus on both Friedman's revealing comments *and* the report from the local *Washington Times* on the U.S. Army's concerns about the Mossad's false flag trickery, both stories of critical importance that could have otherwise been lost in the massive avalanche of press frenzy following 9-11.

Later, as the media added garbage upon garbage onto its mound of "evidence" that "the Muslims" were not only responsible for 9-11 but also—horror of horrors—conveying the Hellish lie it was actually Israel behind the tragedy, one pro-Israel propagandist, Harold Brackman of the Simon Wiesenthal Center, prepared a special report entitled *9/11 Digital Lies: A Survey of Online Apologists for Global Terrorism*.

One bit of "evidence" of Muslim perfidy cited by Brackman was a quote attributed to Sheikh Muhammed Hussein Fadlullah of Hizbollah on Islam On Line on Sept. 15, 2001. The sheikh's offending remark was that "Israel is the main beneficiary of this terrible tragedy."

In fact, most of those who expressed outrage at the sheikh's words probably had no idea the sheikh's remarks precisely echoed what our respected former CIA official, George Friedman, a Jewish American, had said immediately after the 9-11 attacks.

And note, too, what former Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said about what the 9-11 attacks meant for relations between the United States and Israel. The Sept. 12, 2001 issue of *The New York Times* quoted Netanyahu as saying frankly, "It's very good," then adding hurriedly, "Well, not very good, but it will generate immediate sympathy."

In 2008 Netanyahu reaffirmed his view that Israel was indeed a beneficiary of 9-11. On April 16, 2008, the online edition of Israel's *Ha'aretz* newspaper reported that, speaking at Bar Ilan University, Netanyahu had said, "We are are benefiting from one thing, and that is the attack on the Twin Towers and Pentagon, and the American struggle in Iraq."

Ha'aretz cited the other prominent Israeli newspaper, *Ma'ariv*, as having said that Netanyahu had also added that those events “swung American public opinion in our favor.”

Perhaps not coincidentally, in the aftermath of the bombing at the Boston Marathon in early 2013, Ron Dermer a diplomatic advisor known to be especially close to Netanyahu—once again serving as prime minister—told Jewish leaders in New York that, just like the 9-11 attacks, the Boston bombing would increase American support for Israel. The April 19, 2013 issue of *Ha'aretz* reported that Dermer said:

The bulk of the American people stand firmly with Israel and identify with Israel. If you can look, historically, there was a big change after 911, and I am sure that after the tragic bombing in Boston, people will identify more with Israel and its struggle against terrorism and we can maintain that support.

Again—Who benefits?

On that historic day—September 11, 2001—I watched thousands of frightened federal workers streaming down Pennsylvania Avenue on Capitol Hill—right past the office of *American Free Press*—on foot and in their vehicles, fleeing Washington into the suburbs, not knowing whether further attacks lay ahead.

This was a chilling sight, made all the more unsettling because it was a bright, sunny, really beautiful day, one of the most gorgeous days we had all summer—hardly a day (one would think) that could mark the first day of the last days of mankind.

That evening, as the sun was going down and my colleague, Willis Carto, and I made our way back up Pennsylvania Avenue in the direction of the U.S. Capitol—then being said to have been one of the original terrorist targets—I surveyed the eerily empty street before us and I turned to Willis and commented, “Well, if there’s one thing for certain, it’s this: The world will never be the same again.”

Willis nodded and—with a notably somber look on his otherwise usually animated face—remarked quietly, “You can say that again.”

Today, many years later, I do know this much: What we have been told as to “what happened on 9-11” is anything but the truth. The American government and the mass media have been lying from day one about what happened. They lied about 9-11 just as they lied about the Oklahoma City bombing and the JFK assassination before it.

And I know why the U.S. government lied. And I do know who was ultimately responsible for each and every one of those tragedies. And it’s the 9-11 tragedy that we’ll be talking about in the pages ahead.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN:

The Curtain of Deceit: A Fabric of Lies; Blame Bush, the New World Order, the CIA, But by No Means Blame Israel!

By way of being an essay on the parameters of popular discussion and so-called “independent” dissent on the official version of what really happened on September 11, 2001. Why many self-styled “9-11 truth seekers” fail to look at the big picture.

It is an article of faith among the vast majority of Americans—even many who have doubts about the “official” story of what really happened on September 11, 2001—that the 9-11 attacks were carried out by fanatic Muslims who were under, at the least, the spiritual discipline (if not the immediate guidance) of Osama bin Laden.

Although there are growing numbers who are beginning to believe that much evidence points toward the possible culpability of at least some American defense and intelligence personnel in having foreknowledge of—or involvement in—the 9-11 attacks (presumably in order to advance a covert agenda involving U.S. imperial ambitions—a point this study has no problem in accepting) the truth is that there is also a wide-ranging array of data indicating Israel’s Mossad not only had advance knowledge of the attacks and allowed them to proceed but, in fact, that *Israeli intelligence directed and facilitated the 9-11 attacks.*

Needless to say, this proposition is met with squeals of outrage—mostly from what Pat Buchanan referred to as Israel’s “Amen Corner” in this country—but in these pages we will present this thesis as a plausible alternative explanation of the events of 9-11.

All of this will be uncomfortable reading for those who rely on the so-called “mainstream” sources of “news,” but we hasten to point out, up front, that if it were discovered that Israel did have foreknowledge of—or direct involvement in—the events of 9-11, *none of those news sources would ever rush forward with the evidence.*

It is an indisputable fact—hysterical protests to the contrary—that the primary major news sources in America—both publications and broadcast outlets are—if not owned or controlled outright by Jewish families and interests sympathetic to Israel—otherwise dominated at the highest editorial levels by persons sympathetic to Israel or under the direction of those who are. This is not a “myth from the Muslim world.” It’s a cold, hard fact, not honestly subject to dispute.

On the same token, there are naive folks who would rise up in their most righteous indignation and say, “Well, if Israel was involved in the 9-11 attacks, then our president, George W. Bush, would have said so.”

We think not. The truth is that if the Bush administration had brought forth such evidence, the president would have been shouted down. He would have been declared “an anti-Semitic hate-monger” and hounded out of office by an enraged media, probably declared incompetent by the Cabinet and removed through the mechanism of the 22nd Amendment which permits the Cabinet to remove a president from office if he is found incapable of holding the office.

So, in the wake of 9-11, Junior Bush chose what might be called the “path of least resistance” and opted instead to target Afghanistan, a long-time center of intrigue and the target of historic imperial design.

(Nor should we ignore the fact that this same administration was littered with pro-Israel operatives among the now-infamous “neo-conservative” network, a clique of intriguers who would have certainly undercut any serious attempt by real patriots inside the government to expose Israeli involvement in the 9-11 attacks.)

Ultimately, of course, Saddam Hussein’s Iraq came into the gun sights, although—as we now know too well—the pro-Zionist ideologues in the Bush administration were eager to include Iraq as a target immediately in the wake of the 9-11 attacks.

Now here’s where things get a bit tricky.

As we’ve noted, there are quite a few self-styled “independent researchers” who, to their credit, questioned the official version of 9-11. However, there is one constant thread in much of their “research”: they studiously avoid mentioning the possibility of Israeli foreknowledge or involvement in the matter. Instead, they direct attention to CIA and FBI bungling and/or foreknowledge of possible terrorist attacks.

In their boldest ventures into discussion outside popular understanding of 9-11, these “researchers” focus on long-standing Bush family (and Bush circle) financial connections to Arab (usually Saudi) interests, as though that “proves” Junior Bush either had foreknowledge of the 9-11 attacks or that, in some way, the Bush family is culpable because some Arab princes in Riyadh may have been aware of what lay ahead.

But then, again, this is all based on a presumption—faulty, we shall see—that the responsibility for 9-11 did indeed lie in the laps of those stereotypical “rich Arabs” who have always been favorite villains in the Jewish-controlled mass media, including, especially, Hollywood.

(That’s the same Hollywood that Internet bigmouth Alex Jones once claimed was controlled by “the Arabs.” And that’s the same Alex Jones—whose rise to wide fame sponsored by Jewish-owned Sirius satellite network—who says “the New World Order” was behind 9-11. And that’s the same Alex Jones who touted the idea there was a “Saudi connection” to the Boston Marathon bombing. Need we say more?)

Of course, the reasoning behind such prevarication regarding Bush family ties to the Arabs (and the implication that the Bushes and their Saudi friends were to blame for 9-11) is stilted in and of itself.

According to even the official version of events, Osama bin Laden, alleged 9-11 mastermind, was a maverick rebel who abandoned his ties to the Western-oriented Arab leaders and broke away to lead an Islamic fundamentalist rebellion.

Those who “discover” Bush connections to the Arab elite don’t seem to understand that this given fact doesn’t particularly gibe with their “independent” version of events.

However, because, again, these “dissenters” have fallen into the trap of avoiding even to dare mention possible Israeli involvement, they force themselves to shape their own “alternative” history of 9-11 to accommodate the thesis that “the Arabs did it” (on behalf of Bush!).

And since Bush and his family and their associates did have a historic—although largely little-known to the American public—involvement with the Saudi and Arabic elite, these researchers conclude this must somehow “prove” that Bush and the Arabs were in cahoots in bringing about the 9-11 attacks.

Now all of this does not mean that these researchers were not on the right track when they suggested there was more to bin Laden than meets the eye—that is, that bin Laden was initially a creature of the CIA (and of Bush-connected intelligence circles in the American elite). In fact, bin Laden did have a long-standing connection to the operations of the CIA in its Middle East intrigues in league with Israel’s Mossad.

But then, again, it is simply not “politically correct” to mention the misdeeds of Israel and the Mossad. And even those who do dare to mention that bin Laden and many of the Islamic fundamentalists in his sphere of influence who were involved in fighting the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan did work directly with the Mossad are certain to be called . . . “anti-Semitic.” And today in America, that—as my old friend, the late Dallas Texas Naylor would say—is “a very serious charge.

Two “independent researchers” who have a history (like many others) of looking the other way when it comes to Israel and 9-11 bear mentioning. They are John Judge and Michael Ruppert.

Judge, a longtime wader—not a swimmer—in the sea of conspiracy research (he never goes out too far, usually up to his knees, but no further) can scream “CIA” as loud as the little old lady sitting on her rocking chair on the veranda, but the word “Mossad” has never been a part of his vocabulary. For years he has assembled seminars on the JFK assassination—and more recently, on 9-11—but one will never find Judge daring to mention the Mossad, at least not in a negative sense.

Judge is not particularly reliable either. In the early 1990s he asserted that Mark Lane—the longtime critic of the CIA who was among the first to point the finger directly at the CIA in the assassination of President Kennedy—had always avoided mentioning CIA involvement in the assassination, despite the easily-documentable fact that as far back as August 7, 1970 Lane had written an article for *The Los Angeles Free Press* (LAFP) entitled “CIA Killed JFK to Keep War Going,” a point that Lane underscored in far greater detail in a full-length LAFP special report headlined “JFK Murder Solved: Killing Coordinated by CIA.”

So, as we said, Judge is not reliable, but he has acted as a skilled disinformation specialist and, for obvious reasons, has widely been suspected of being some sort of officially-sanctioned “gatekeeper” charged with the dubious responsibility of attacking serious critics of high-level misdeeds and muddying the waters of inquiry all the further.

The case of Ruppert, is a bit more complicated, but equally telling. Although Ruppert’s endeavors contributed to the cause of independent research into the intrigues of the intelligence community, particularly some of the international drug-arms-and-money laundering escapades of the CIA (which, more often than not, have involved the Mossad, although the Mossad is seldom, if ever, mentioned in Ruppert’s rendering of events), Ruppert has demonstrated a remarkable capacity, obviously, to give the Mossad a “clear” as far as any criminal culpability is concerned. And so it was with his “investigation” into 9-11.

Note this: At a speech at Portland State University, Ruppert energetically denounced what he said were rumors being circulated by what he called the “right wing” that Israel was involved in 9-11. Ruppert said that was all a bunch of “bullpucky,” a choice term that may or not may be Yiddish in origin. (And I’m only being *slightly* facetious here.)

In the next breath, Ruppert praised Israel, saying the Israelis *did* have specific advance knowledge about the impending attacks and warned the United States to beware. God bless Israel!

Then Ruppert cited a number of media reports that appeared just after 9-11. The Israelis—in Ruppert’s assessment, at that point—were essentially “the good guys”—a wonderful ally—whose warnings had been stupidly ignored (or perhaps deliberately suppressed) by bunglers or traitors—take your pick—in U.S. defense and intelligence.

As additional evidence of Israeli foreknowledge, Ruppert cited the fact that Israel’s Zim shipping company actually closed its office in the World Trade Center (WTC) one week before the attacks, losing money in the process by breaking its lease. Ruppert then mournfully raised the question as to why “our” government did not likewise warn Americans in the WTC about the impending tragedy.

While Ruppert's allegation about Zim's withdrawal from the WTC was quite correct—and reported early on by *American Free Press* (AFP), a newspaper Ruppert was careful never to mention since AFP is forthrightly critical of Israel—Ruppert seemed to miss the point that even raising the story about Zim was considered “beyond the pale” and “anti-Semitic” since—the official story goes—Israel had absolutely no foreknowledge of the impending attacks.

Although, initially, Ruppert wanted to place all of the blame for 9-11 on the Bush administration and absolve Israel of any blame whatsoever, he began to shift his own line somewhat by the time his book on 9-11, *Crossing the Rubicon*, was finally committed to print.

In that volume, Ruppert actually went so far as to finally suggest that Israel had indeed played a part in 9-11, but that it was acting as an agent of the United States ruling elite. Ruppert was essentially suggesting that Israel (however much it actually benefited from the consequences of 9-11) was, if anything, a secondary partner of the United States intriguers whom Ruppert charged were responsible for the tragedy.

Israel, as presented by Ruppert, was some sort of victim of U.S. intrigue, forced to act—perhaps against its will (poor little country)—as a pathetic tool of U.S. imperialism.

Ruppert went to great lengths in his book to assure his readers that he was “not anti-Semitic” and quite apologetically insisted that two of his chief allies in the preparation of his book were Jewish and therefore “proof” that he, Ruppert, was not anti-Semitic.

Yet, despite his protestations, Ruppert's book hardly presented much of a case at all that Israel did have a part in the 9-11 attacks. In fact, the rather physically substantial book, if placed under an analytic magnifying glass, was largely devoted to peripheral issues and analysis that hardly shed any direct light on 9-11 itself.

Although the volume appeared to be quite an accomplishment if judged solely on its length, it is actually quite diversionary, with the ultimate effect of downplaying (really, negating) Israel's role in 9-11.

Based on the theory that “Oil Not Israel” was the motivating cause behind alleged U.S. orchestration of the 9-11 attacks, when it is case of quite precisely the opposite, the patently obvious obfuscation on this particular question by Ruppert does direct attention to the fact that much of the material circulated about 9-11 has actually been quite a bit of misinformation and, more importantly, deliberate disinformation.

And all of this, once again, underscores the need for an all-out open, un-biased public inquiry into what really did happen.

In the end, Ruppert astounded many in the 9-11 research community by declaring the case “closed,” as though he alone had “found the

answers” and that no more need be said about the matter. It is no wonder then that genuine truth seekers concluded that, from the beginning, Ruppert had been no more than another “infiltrator,” a “gatekeeper” whose primary motive was to bury the truth, rather than find it.

Now that all is said and done, however, Rupert has largely been eclipsed, even forgotten, but his initial influence in discussion of 9-11 was considerable and indeed destructive.

At this juncture it is appropriate to give credit where credit is due: Victor Thorn and Lisa Guliani of Wingtv.net were among the first to blow the whistle on Ruppert and show him for the diversionary force he proved to be. Although Thorn and Guliani took a lot of heat for daring to confront Rupert’s prevarications head on, they were very much vindicated and are now widely recognized for speaking truth to power in the course of their own effort to lay bare the real facts about 9-11.

Thorn’s own work, *9-11 Evil*—issued under the auspices of *American Free Press*—bears the distinction of being the first in-print work of consequence to examine Israeli complicity in 9-11, later followed by his supplementary volume, *Made in Israel: 9-11 and the Jewish Plot Against America*.

There are other 9-11 researchers who don’t have the high profile of Michael Ruppert but it has become all too apparent that many of the so-called “independent” researchers are fearful of addressing the Israeli connection to 9-11, which, consequently, directs (or misdirects) what they will (or will not) say about 9-11.

All of this having been said, let us come to the key question . . .

Why would Israel have an interest in allowing the 9-11 attacks to happen or, in an even more sinister scenario which this book, *False Flags* puts forth, actually perpetrate the tragedy?

The answer is simple—so simple—that it might, quite ironically conversely, be “too big” for the average American to understand. Earlier we heard how former CIA analyst George Friedman had to say about why Israel was the immediate beneficiary of 9-11 and he was right. But there’s more to the story and it’s critical we examine it here and now.

The historical record shows that in the year preceding the 9-11 attacks, Israel was becoming a virtual world outcast—perhaps more than it had ever been—its heavy-handed crackdown on the Muslim and Christian Palestinians a phenomenal scandal that had resulted in global condemnation of Israel’s violence and brutality.

Thousands of people were marching in the United States—even in the United States, it might be stressed—and millions were marching around the globe, loudly and publicly and forcefully condemning Israel and vocally siding with the beleaguered Palestinians.

For the first time since Israel came into being in 1948, the tiny, yet powerful, nation was widely perceived as a villain and a perpetrator, rather than as a victim, by people *outside* the Arab world. Israel was under siege for its misdeeds and its very right to exist was being called into question. Increasing numbers of even Jewish voices were questioning the very viability of “the Zionist project,” and its future.

In addition, although American Christian fundamentalists remained steadfast supporters of the Jewish state, leaders of many mainstream Christian churches were beginning to rally behind the Palestinian cause.

The situation for Israel was bad indeed—climaxed, just prior to September 11, by the international conference on racism in Durban, South Africa. There, people from around the globe were saying that Israel’s treatment of the Palestinians was hardly different from the accounts of Nazi Germany’s treatment of the European Jews.

It was a bitter pill to swallow for many Americans who, until then, had perceived Israel to be some sort of “special” nation loudly hailed for its bravery in the face of war, a little country that had “risen from the ashes of the Holocaust.” Even devotion to Israel on the part of America’s liberal community—which had historically been a foundation of intellectual support for Israel—was beginning to crack.

September 11, 2001 changed all that—almost instantaneously. The “news” that Islamic fundamentalists—and largely natives of America’s staunchest Arab ally, Saudi Arabia—were responsible for the slaughter of 3,000 Americans was equated by the media (with intense, over-the-top enthusiasm, it might be said) as a reflection of what “little Israel” had suffered for 50 years at the hands of those same Arabs.

However, the word “Israel” was seldom advanced in media commentary on that black day and in the weeks and months that followed, *at least in the context of “why” American had been attacked on 9-11.*

To his credit, Alexander Cockburn, writing in *The Nation*, was one commentator who bothered to mention that fact. The “attack on America” was presented as if it had happened in some unusual vacuum, as if U.S. Middle East policy was absolutely no part of the equation.

Instead, the media was quick to ask the question, “Why do they hate us?” and the answer was regularly supplied by such pro-Israel Jewish commentators as “terrorism expert” Stephen Emerson and famed “Orientalist” Bernard Lewis, most notable among those who arrogantly and condescendingly explained that “they hate us” because “they” were “jealous” and “envious” of Western civilization, that America is perceived as the pinnacle of Western civilization, that America’s “democracy” and “way of life” were painful realities for the backward, savage Arabs and Muslims who wanted to destroy it all.

The Arabs and the Muslims also hated Judaism and Christianity, they said, conveniently ignoring the fact that Muslims revere Christ and that there are many Arabs who are Christians and have been for 2,000 years.

Seldom was it mentioned that there was a widespread distaste within that Arab world, not for the American people or their way of life, but instead for U.S. government policies and a perception (an accurate one) that the pro-Israel lobby in the United States had an inordinate influence on both the Congress and the presidency, not to mention the mass media and other centers of power in American life.

So while these Zionist propagandists were busy telling us that “they hate us” because of—well, almost everything—the media and the experts were careful to avoid mentioning one very real reason that could have instigated the very type of attack that Americans experienced on September 11. And this itself is quite revealing, for it demonstrates that carefully-crafted curtain of deceit, drawn together from a fabric of lies, that surrounded the 9-11 attacks from the beginning.

While it was certainly true that Muslim fundamentalists could have been motivated to attack the United States because of its policies favoring Israel . . . *that possible motivation was never mentioned*. The whole issue of U.S. Middle East policy was suppressed.

And while, admittedly, the word “never” is a strong and definitive word, it is indeed largely correct. It was decided—virtually ruled—early on that “the Muslims did it” and they did it because “they hate us” and the reason they hate us is . . . well, certainly nothing to do with Israel, for God’s sake! Why that’s ridiculous—just not true. Or so “they” said.

All of this is particularly interesting, though, in that, in almost the same breath, media commentators were crowing that the 9-11 attacks demonstrated the need for the United States to further align itself with Israel, that Israel and the United States were now as one, that, as one pro-Israel commentator put it so insistently: “We are all Israelis now.”

Naturally, the idea that Israel was the prime mover behind 9-11—although still not so widely known within the general public—has created much distress for Israel and its supporters. One advocate for Israel, a Canadian Jewish writer of conservative bent, Jonathan Kay, has written an entire book declaiming against those known as the “9-11 truthers.”

Although Kay condemns any and all dissent against the official rendition of 9-11, he reserves special ire for those who suggest Israel was behind that tragedy. But what is especially revealing is that Kay openly acknowledges—even celebrates—the role 9-11 played in firmly bringing the United States into the Zionist camp. In his book, *Among the Truthers: A Journey Through America’s Growing Conspiracist Underground*, Kay writes:

If the Holocaust and the reaction of the Jewish state jointly marked the first great turning point in the modern history of anti-Semitism, 9-11 marked the second.

Following the attacks, supporters of Israel spoke of a silver lining. The war against militant Islam suddenly was a global one. Now, the whole world would see and understand the sort of nihilistic hatred that Israelis confronted every day.

. . . America's fight became Israel's fight. Over the last decade, a period during which Republicans and Democrats [had] fought over every other subject imaginable, support for Israel [remained] one of the few issues to attract virtually unanimous bipartisan support.

Among war hawks on the Right, in particular, the sudden identification of militant Islam as America's greatest enemy capped a startling transformation in the perception of the American Jewish community [by the Right].

Whereas Jews might once have threatened the American Right in their roles as communists, anarchists, trade unionists, civil rights leaders, and Ivy League intellectuals, no Jew could ever be an Islamist. Just the opposite:

The Jew was the perfect *anti*-Islamist, whose zeal and reliability in the war on terrorism was hard-wired into his political DNA thanks to six decades of Israeli warfare against Islamic terrorists in the Middle East. [Kay's emphasis.]

For the first time in the history of Western civilization, the Jew's "foreignness" and mixed loyalties—to the United States, Israel, world Jewry—became a source of respect and trust rather than suspicion.

Kay finally lays it all on the line: The ultimate result of 9-11 . . .

The September 11 attacks changed America in a thousand different ways. Perhaps the most ironic, given the terrorists' intensely anti-Semitic ideology, was that it cemented the long process leading to Jews' full-fledged ascension into the American establishment.

In fact—as we shall see—there is good reason to believe that Israel did play the central role in bringing about the awful events of that terrible day. Let us then proceed and demonstrate a likely scenario as to how Israel once again utilized its tried-and-true tactic of employing "false flags" in orchestrating the events of 9-11.

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

The Mossad Link(s) to the First Attack (in 1993) on the World Trade Center

As noted earlier—and this is a point that cannot be over-emphasized—*American Free Press* has been virtually the only media voice to report what the late Robert I. Friedman revealed in the August 3, 1993 issue of New York’s alternative weekly, *The Village Voice*: namely, the Mossad connection to the first attack on the World Trade Center on Feb. 26, 1993.

Friedman’s revelations have been largely suppressed—even by many dissidents who question the official version of 9-11—precisely because that report by this long-revered investigative journalist—who happened to be Jewish—does raise the specter of Israeli involvement in the 2001 attack on the World Trade Center.

And that’s just not a realm into which many of the 9-11 dissidents want to go. It’s much easier to say “Bush did it” or “the CIA did it” or “the New World Order did it.” But don’t dare say: “The Mossad did it.”

However, in the first issue of *American Free Press* (dated Sept. 24) published after 9-11, I resurrected Friedman’s data about the 1993 attack in exploring the likelihood of Israeli involvement in 9-11.

The all-new AFP report was headlined “Mossad Link to First WTC Bombing Raises Eyebrows” and pointed out that Friedman’s original report “bears noting in the aftermath of the terror of Sept. 11.” Here is what Friedman had revealed—eight years before:

According to Friedman’s own sources in Israeli intelligence, Ahmad Ajaj, a 27-year-old West Bank Palestinian held in federal custody for conspiring to bomb the World Trade Center, may have been a Mossad mole.

Arrested at Kennedy Airport on September 1, 1992, after he arrived on a Pakistani International flight from Peshawar carrying a forged Swedish passport and bomb-making manuals, Ajaj was taken into custody, and subsequently pleaded guilty to entering the country illegally.

(Ajaj’s traveling companion was Ramzi Ahmed Yousef, described as an Iraqi who law enforcement sources later said would turn out to be a “key player” in the 1993 World Trade Center bombing. Don’t forget about Yousef. Later in these pages we will come to know him—and one of his uncles in particular—a little better.)

Although the FBI identified Ajaj as a senior intifada terrorist, with links to Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic fundamentalist organization, Friedman reported that *Kol Ha’ir*, a respected Hebrew-language weekly published in Jerusalem, said Ajaj was never involved in intifada activities or with Hamas or even the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Instead, according to *Kol Ha'ir*, Ajaj was actually a petty crook arrested in 1988 for counterfeiting U.S. dollars out of a base in East Jerusalem. Ajaj was convicted of the counterfeiting charges and then sentenced to two-and-a-half years in prison.

Then, wrote Friedman:

It was during his prison stay that Mossad, Israel's CIA, apparently recruited him, say Israeli intelligence sources. By the time he was released after having served just one year, he had seemingly undergone a radical transformation.

Friedman reported Ajaj had suddenly become a devout Muslim and an outspoken hard-line nationalist.

Then, Ajaj was arrested for smuggling weapons into the West Bank, supposedly for El Fatah, a faction of the PLO.

But Friedman said this was actually a sham. Friedman's sources in Israeli intelligence said the arrest and Ajaj's subsequent deportation were "staged by Mossad to establish his credentials as an intifada activist." According to Friedman:

Mossad allegedly "tasked" Ajaj to infiltrate radical Palestinian groups operating outside Israel and to report back to Tel Aviv. Israeli intelligence sources say that it is not unusual for Mossad to recruit from the ranks of common criminals.

After Ajaj's deportation from Israel, he showed up in Pakistan, in the company of the Mujahideen rebels who were fighting against the Soviets in Afghanistan. And this, in itself, could point further evidence that Ajaj was working for the Mossad.

According to *Covert Action Information Bulletin* (September 1987), the funding and supply lines for the Mujahideen were the "the second largest covert operation" in the CIA's history.

However—according to former Mossad operative Victor Ostrovsky (writing in *The Other Side of Deception*)—those funding and supply lines for the Mujahideen were under the direct supervision of Israel's Mossad. Ostrovsky wrote:

It was a complex pipeline, since a large portion of the Mujahideen's weapons were American-made and were supplied to the Muslim Brotherhood directly from Israel, using as carriers the Bedouin nomads who roamed the demilitarized zones in the Sinai.

After Ajaj's ventures with the Mujahideen, he popped up in New York to befriend members of a small so-called "radical" clique surrounding Sheikh Abdel-Rahman later accused of being the mastermind of the World Trade Center bombing.

On February 26, 1993, the day of the bombing, Ajaj was "safe" in federal prison serving a six-month sentence for entering the country on a forged passport. Later, he was indicted for conspiracy in the bombing.

According to Friedman:

If Ajaj *was* recruited by Mossad [Friedman's emphasis], it is not known whether he continued to work for the Israeli spy agency after he was deported. One possibility, of course, is that upon leaving Israel and meeting radical Muslims close to the blind Egyptian sheikh, his loyalties shifted.

However, Friedman also reported:

Another scenario is that he had advance knowledge of the World Trade Center bombing, which he shared with Mossad, and that Mossad, for whatever reason, kept the secret to itself. If true, U.S. intelligence sources speculate that Mossad might have decided to keep the information closely guarded so as not to compromise its undercover agent.

Friedman broke amazing ground with these revelations that were ignored by the mainstream press and by many in the "alternative" media who were otherwise, in the aftermath of the 9-11 tragedy, raising questions about the U.S. government's official version of events.

But here is something that Friedman did not mention in his article—and which only came out later . . .

The copy of the infamous volume—described as "the Al-Qaeda Terrorist Training Manual"—that received widespread publicity following the events of 9-11 had been uncovered in the possession of Ahmad Ajaj, the Mossad undercover informant in the first WTC attack.

And that point speaks volumes.

However, there's much more to the story of the first WTC attack.

It also turns out that the FBI itself had its own undercover informant inside the "Arab bomb plot" and did nothing—repeat nothing—to prevent the tragedy from happening.

The facts indicate that the FBI had an informant inside the so-called "Arab terrorist cell" that may have fronted for Israel's Mossad in the World Trade Center bombing.

Although Americans were told the blind sheik, Omar Abdel-Rahman, was the mastermind of the bombing, what they don't know is that one of the sheik's security guards, Emad A. Salem, was an FBI informant who had filled in the FBI, in advance, of the specifics of the bomb plot.

The FBI officially severed its contacts with Salem seven months before the bombing. However, in the aftermath of the tragedy, the FBI opened up relations with Salem once again. At that time, however, Salem—unknown to the FBI—began recording his exchanges with his FBI handler.

Salem's recorded conversations confirmed the FBI, in fact, had extensive prior knowledge of the plot to bomb the trade center. The recordings indicate Salem had told the FBI that he would sabotage the plot by replacing the explosive components of the bomb with an inert powder, after which time the FBI could come in and capture those involved in the conspiracy.

In his book, *The Medusa File*, Craig Roberts, a well-regarded 26-year veteran police officer and U.S. Marine Vietnam veteran, outlined the parameters of this outrageous scandal that has been buried by the mainstream media. According to Roberts:

It seems that the FBI actually had more than a simple "informant" inside Rahman's terrorist cell. What they actually had was an Egyptian intelligence officer named Emad Salem, who reported directly to his FBI control agent, Special Agent John Anticev. Salem, it turns out, was hired to infiltrate the Rahman group long before the bombing took place, and consistently reported on the activities of the radicals—including their plans to conduct bombings in the New York City area.

What the FBI did not know was that Salem recorded his conversations with his control agents. The tapes tell a far different story than the official versions of the "investigation."

According to *The New York Times*, which managed to obtain secret transcripts of some of the conversations, the FBI knew in advance when the bomb was going to be planted, who was going to do it, the names of everyone in the terrorist cell, and where the truck was rented.

But worse, one tape went even further. It seems that the FBI not only knew about the planning, they actually assisted the bombers in obtaining and constructing the bomb!

The original FBI plan was for the informant to provide a non-explosive substance that would be labeled "ammonium nitrate," then use it to construct a "bomb" that would not go off.

All the FBI needed to show in court was the elements of conspiracy and intent. It would be a classic “sting” operation and the FBI would come out in the media as heroes—a much-needed polishing of their tarnished image since the earlier debacle at Ruby Ridge, Idaho.

Instead of arresting the conspirators when they received inside information that the bombing was being planned, the FBI instead kept their source in place and continued to monitor the progress of the terrorists in planning and preparing for their goal. According to the transcripts, the plan was changed and the informant was directed to provide the terrorists with real explosive materials.

The reasoning behind this may have been simply that showing “intent” might not be enough to make a terrorism case in court, and that if real explosives were discovered then the case would make itself. But whatever the reason, the plan moved into stage two: building the bomb.

According to reports and transcripts, Salem was instructed to not only provide the materials, but to give instruction and help in building the bomb itself . . . In [one] transcript [Salem] admitted [to his FBI handlers] that he used government funds to procure the materials and build the bomb for the Rahman group, as he was instructed to do.

There’s another interesting Mossad connection to the first attack on the World Trade Center that—again—seems to have been lost in the shuffle, ignored by the “brave” 9-11 dissidents who prefer to blame “the New World Order” and “the Illuminati” or even the CIA for the crime.

On March 19, 1993, writing in *Middle East International*, respected journalist Jane Hunter noted the little-known story behind the story of the Palestinian, Muhahham A. Salameh, who actually rented the van said to have been used in the trade center bombing. Miss Hunter wrote:

Officials have kept a tight lid on the possible involvement of an Israeli woman in the case. Salameh gave the name and phone number of Guzie Hadass as a reference when he rented the van. According to the complaint read at his court appearance, Hadass’s phone was at a Jersey City apartment.

FBI agents found a letter addressed to him there (its contents were not disclosed) and, according to the complaint, “tools and wiring, and manuals concerning antennae, circuitry and electromagnetic devices.”

The complaint notes that an expert interpreted all this was evidence that a “bomb maker” had been in the apartment; it said that a dog trained to sniff explosives “responded positively.” *The International Herald Tribune* of 8 March [1993] quoted FBI spokesman Joe Valiquette as saying: “We have no idea whether Hadass is a member of the Israeli Mossad, but even if it were true, we wouldn’t tell you anyway.”

These details about the first World Trade Center tragedy paint a starkly different picture of what happened than what we have been told by the FBI and their allies in the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith—the Jewish lobby group generally known as “the ADL.”

Now why, you may ask, do we bring in—seemingly from out of the blue—a reference to the FBI’s allies at the ADL?

Well, the ADL connection is *quite relevant*. It just so happens that Neil Herman, a high-ranking former ex-FBI official who helped cover up the Mossad connections to the first bombing of the World Trade Center in 1993—as well as, obviously, FBI foreknowledge of the planning of the crime—was later appointed in 1998 as chief of the “fact finding” (i.e. spy) division of the ADL, one of the Mossad’s chief American conduits.

A 27-year FBI veteran who formerly headed the FBI’s Joint Terrorism Task Force, Herman was not only the director of the FBI’s “investigation” into the World Trade Center attack, but also the suspicious FBI inquiry into the downing of TWA Flight 800 off Long Island on July 16, 1997.

A high-level cover-up artist *par excellence*—one with obvious sympathies for Israel and the Jewish agenda, demonstrated by his association with the ADL—Herman exemplified the long-standing covert relationship between the FBI and the ADL, forged by J. Edgar Hoover prior to World War II, that was clearly “going public” with a vengeance.

As ADL spymaster, Herman was positioned to provide the ADL far more wide-ranging contacts within the FBI and the intelligence community than ever before, but he did not remain in the post for long. Herman soon popped up on the “crisis management team” at Burson-Marsteller, the global public relations giant.

Presumably, Herman found greener—as in money—pastures at Burson-Marsteller, but the ADL had been able to tout the prestige of listing a former high-ranking FBI official and “expert on terrorism” on its letterhead, which was probably the game all along.

Herman, by the way, was eventually succeeded as chief of spying operations at the ADL by one Mark Pitcavage whose antecedents link back directly to the intrigues by the ADL and the Southern Poverty Law Center in the wake of the Oklahoma City bombing.

While the ADL and the SPLC were busy pushing the spotlight toward “the militias” as the milieu from which, they said, Timoth McVeigh emerged, the two groups were doing everything they could to suppress public knowledge about the enigmatic Mossad-connected SPLC informant Andreas Strassmeir, adamantly dismissing any mention of Strassmeir and his associate Kirk Lyons in relation to the Oklahoma bombing as being conspiracy theory nonsense.

It was during this time the aforementioned Pitcavage—through a group called “the Militia Watchdog”—was fronting for the ADL-SPLC spinmeisters, supplying data to the media about the “dangers” posed by the militia groups which, if truth be told, were not so big and not so powerful and largely quite tame. Then, according to the ADL:

In early 1996, Pitcavage became involved with—and later the Research Director of—the SLATT Program (State and Local Anti-Terrorism Training Program), a Justice Department program designed to educate senior state and local law enforcement officials on domestic terrorism issues.

It is conducted jointly by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Institute for Intergovernmental Research, a non-profit organization. Mark Pitcavage was a Senior Research Associate at the Institute.

While involved with the SLATT program, Pitcavage provided training to thousands of law enforcement officers at every level and in every section of the country, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

These details about both Pitcavage and Herman—both of whom had FBI associations prior to coming to the ADL—give us a revealing window into the manner in which the Mossad—through the venue of groups such as the ADL and the SPLC—has been able to penetrate both law enforcement at local, state and federal levels and the American intelligence community.

And these details also help us understand why Mossad connections to such matters as the JFK assassination, the Oklahoma City bombing and the 9-11 tragedy remain under wraps.

It is another ugly profile of the manner in which the Mossad has been operating under false flags on American soil, and one which—quite obviously—raises the question: “If the Israelis were responsible for the first attack on the World Trade Center in 1993—using Arabs as “false flags”—did they come back in 2001 to finish the job?”

Don't bet against it.

CHAPTER NINETEEN:

The Dancing Israelis Who Celebrated on 9-11

Immediately after the 9-11 attacks, CBS anchor Dan Rather appeared on David Letterman's late night program and declared, in a voice dripping with outrage and disgust, that, even as the tragic events of 9-11 were unfolding, a "cell" of America-hating Arabs had been spotted on the roof of a building across the river from Manhattan in New Jersey, videotaping the World Trade Center tragedy and celebrating as the trade towers collapsed.

However, good newsman that he is, Rather was nonetheless dead wrong about the identity of those celebrating the tragedy.

In fact, as *American Free Press* (AFP) pointed out in a front-page story in its Oct. 1, 2001 issue (which went to press on Sept. 20), those "Arabs" seen dancing merrily, giving each other "high fives" and clearly celebrating the collapse of the trade towers were Israelis—Jewish Israelis—citizens of the nation said to be America's best ally. And AFP said, flat out, that there was evidence to believe that these Israelis were, in fact, assets of Israel's intelligence agency, the Mossad.

For daring to point out these facts, AFP was accused of "peddling anti-Israel conspiracy theories."

But the story that unfolded in the wake of AFP's report—which, by the way, constituted the first serious national recitation of the facts surrounding this affair—proved to be even more broad-ranging and more disturbing and pointed to Mossad foreknowledge of—and involvement in—the 9-11 attacks.

Scattered media reports mentioned that five "Middle Eastern" men had been seen "celebrating" the WTC attack, naturally leaving people with the impression that the men were Arabs or Muslims.

However what is interesting is that, in the early days following 9-11, when the story of that particular group of Israelis did leak into the media and the media did, in fact, mention that the men were Israelis, the media turned the tables in Talmudic fashion and cited the story as evidence that the Arabs and the Muslims and assorted anti-Semites and critics of Israel were generating disinformation to discredit Israel.

For example, the Sept. 28-30, 2001 issue of *USA Today* cited the story of the five Israelis (calling them "Jews" and not identifying their nationality) and attempted to suggest that the story was a myth.

USA Today—which calls itself "America's newspaper"—described the story as one of the "unsubstantiated rumors that implicate Israel" in the 9-11 attacks and one of which "many in the Muslim world are endlessly chewing over and recycling.

But as those who have bothered to follow the story know well, the so-called “rumor” was hardly a rumor, but, in fact, the cornerstone of a much bigger story than initially might have been imagined.

It took some six months before America’s oldest and most respected Jewish community newspaper—the New York-based *Forward*—finally confirmed for the record—in its March 15, 2002 issue—that these Israeli Jews (those same ones described as an Arab “cell” by Dan Rather) were connected to the Mossad.

Forward published information that elaborated upon details first entered into the worldwide news record by AFP and which were subsequently picked up and given widespread distribution on the Internet.

Later we’ll discuss, in more detail, what *Forward* had to say. However, in the meantime, here’s what AFP reported—some six months before—on Oct. 1, 2001, citing reports appearing at the time in local newspapers in New Jersey and New York and elements from its own inquiries. The essentials of the AFP story were as follows:

- At least three different groups of Israelis were taken into custody after eyewitnesses reported seeing them celebrating the 9-11 attacks in three different locations across the river from Manhattan in New Jersey.
- All three of these locations had clear views of the World Trade Center and were ideal places from which to document the tragedy.
- In at least two of the cases, the men were, in fact, videotaping and some witnesses seemed to believe that the Israelis had already set up their recording devices even *before* the first attack on the first trade tower hit on 9-11 (and thus had advance knowledge of the attacks).
- One group was in Liberty State Park in Jersey City, another in Liberty Park in Union City, New Jersey and a third group was in Weehawken, New Jersey on the roof of an Israeli-owned moving company, Urban Moving Systems.
- In each of these three instances the Israelis questioned by the police were connected to Israeli-owned moving companies operating out of New York and New Jersey.

In fact, the five Israelis seen in Jersey City—taken into custody by police in East Rutherford, New Jersey—were driving a van belonging to the *same* Urban Moving Systems upon whose roof the *other* group of five Israelis were also seen celebrating (and videotaping) the events at the World Trade Center.

Naturally, as any honest observer would have to conclude, it was highly unlikely (to say the least) that all of this—three different groups of Israelis connected to the same network of moving companies all acting in the same fashion in three different locations—could hardly be—as defenders of Israel claimed—“just a coincidence.”

In fact, further details emerging from the saga of those who became known as “the dancing Israelis” pointed in quite sinister directions that are, by any estimation, hard to explain.

- AFP noted in reporting on the arrest of the Israelis captured in the Urban Moving Systems van in East Rutherford, *The Bergen* [New Jersey] *Record* revealed on Sept. 12, 2001 that “sources close to the investigation said they found other evidence linking the men to the bombing plot.” The source told the *Record* that:

There are maps of the city in the car with certain places highlighted. It looked like they’re hooked in with this. It looked like they knew what was going to happen when they were at Liberty State Park.

The *Record* also reported that “sources also said that bomb-sniffing dogs reacted as if they had detected explosives.”

According to an Israel National News report on Oct. 26, 2001, these Israel detainees were suspected of “plotting to blow up” a New York bridge, although this allegation never reached most Americans who were being told of “Muslim plots” against Americans.

Initially—and this is interesting—other news sources suggested that explosives *had* been found in the van.

When, in fact, the “official” story from the U.S. government came out—denying the existence of any such explosives—this gave supporters of Israel the opportunity to say that it was a “myth” that these detained Israelis were in the possession of explosives.

Thus, they said, the entire story of the “dancing Israelis” was just based on reckless and inaccurate news reports that were later retracted and upon—of course—plain old hostility to dear little Israel. Anti-Semites and evil Muslims were collaborating to blame Israel for 9-11, or so they said.

But the fact that there were (presumably) no explosives in the van does not, however, preclude the possibility, as the *Bergen Record*’s source had contended that the Israelis were “hooked in” with what happened on September 11, considering all of the suspicious activity by three different groups of Israelis all connected to the same network of Israeli moving companies.

And contrary to stories put out by supporters of Israel, the *Bergen Record* did not retract its original story, for the fact is that the *Record* never claimed that there were explosives in the van.

So the *Record* had nothing to retract. Claims that the *Record* story was wrong are, in short, wrong.

In the meantime, however, these Israelis were never charged with any crime relating to the events of 9-11. Instead, they were turned over to the Immigration and Naturalization Service and quickly deported. This recalls, of course, the deportation, ten days after the Oklahoma City bombing, of the “right wing” Israeli terrorist, Sharon Toval, a virtual look-alike for accused Oklahoma bomber Timothy McVeigh.

The names of these suspects were never released to the public—or at least their names were never published or broadcast in the media.

However, it was not only in the New York-New Jersey area that Israelis working for Israeli-owned moving companies were taken into custody and suspected of involvement in terrorist-related activities. Israeli-connected moving companies seemed to proliferate in the events surrounding 9-11. For example, on Dec. 24, 2001 AFP reported that:

On Oct. 17, the Pulitzer Prize-winning *Pottstown* (Pa.) *Mercury* reported that “two men whom police described as Middle Eastern” were detained in the Pottstown area (which is just northwest of Philadelphia) after being found with “detailed video footage of the Sears Tower in Chicago”—the tallest building in the world, widely mentioned as a possible terrorist target.

The *Mercury* did not identify the men’s nationality, but their names were Moshe Elmakias and Ron Katar. “Moshe” is a Hebrew name which is not likely to have been bestowed on a Muslim or an Arab. A woman named Ayelet Reisler, in their company, was also detained. She had a German passport in her name and medication in a different name.

The two men worked for a company known as “Moving Systems Incorporated.”

Again, supporters of Israel protested that it was “just a coincidence” that several different suspiciously-acting groups of Israelis would be working for moving companies and have detailed videos of the WTC disaster *and* the Sears Tower, another perceived potential terrorist target.

It was subsequently learned that there was a connecting network of Israeli-owned moving companies alongside Urban Moving Systems and Moving Systems, Inc. that operated under such names as Advance Moving System, AAA Van Lines, State to State Van Lines, America’s Best Movers and Quality Moving Storage—not to mention Moshe’s, which maintained a huge brick 15 story warehouse—employing hundreds of young Israelis—just outside the Holland Tunnel in Jersey City.

But, in the end, it was the five Israelis arrested on the roof of Urban Moving Systems (UMS) in Weehawken who received the most attention

from the media and from independent investigators. They were brothers Paul and Sivan Kurzberg, Omer Marmari, Yaon Shmuel and Oded Ellner, all Israelis and all employees of UMS.

On Oct. 8, 2001, *The New York Times* finally reported on the five Israelis treating it as some sad quirk of fate for five innocent men. The *Times* did not report—as did AFP—that there may have been more than one Israeli-connected moving company involved and that there were actually other Israeli nationals taken into custody after the bombing.

And in Israel the plight of these lads also got some attention. The mother of one of the detainees told the Israeli newspaper, *Ha'aretz*, that the FBI had questioned her son as to whether he was an agent of Israel's intelligence agency, the Mossad.

However, why the FBI might suspect that Mossad agents—assets of our valued ally Israel—may have been involved in the so-called “Arab terrorist” attack is a question that was carefully ignored by the mainstream media in America.

But these five young Israelis became very controversial, by anyone's estimation and they had some high-level support.

On Nov. 23, 2001, *Forward*, the respected New York-based Jewish newspaper, reported that “top-ranking Israeli diplomats” had intervened with Attorney General John Ashcroft on behalf of the aforementioned Paul Kurzberg, his brother, and the three other young Israelis.

In its issue dated Dec. 17, 2001—which went to press on Dec. 7—AFP pointed out that Attorney General Ashcroft had released one of those Israelis—Paul Kurzberg—despite the fact that, according to a Nov. 21 report buried deep inside *The New York Times*, Kurzberg “had trouble” with a seven-hour polygraph test administered by the FBI.

Although Kurzberg had reportedly done “better on a second try,” the Israeli suspect still flunked *both* times. In fact, the *Times* had reported, Kurzberg “refused on principle to divulge much about his role in the Israeli army or subsequently working for people who may have had ties to Israeli intelligence.”

Yet, Ashcroft sent Kurzer and his four associates home to Israel, the suspicions surrounding them notwithstanding.

It was upon returning to the fabled land of milk and honey that one of the young Israelis, Oded Ellner, made remarks that today are a part of the lore surrounding suspicion of Israeli involvement in 9-11.

We refer to the often-heard claim that Ellner actually admitted in an interview on Israeli television that he and his colleagues had foreknowledge of the impending attack on the World Trade Center and that, he said, the reason why he and his friends were videotaping was that “our purpose was to document the event.”

This is a story that has captured the imagination of many sincere folks who do believe—as I do—that Israel not only had foreknowledge of the 9-11 attacks but actually orchestrated them.

Some quickly jumped upon this as some sort of “confession” and circulated the word on the Internet that Ellner had admitted—on television—that he and his associates had advance knowledge of the attack on the trade center and were, therefore, already set up and prepared to videotape the tragedy.

However, the story surrounding Ellner’s televised remarks is actually a distraction and—I am here to tell you without hesitation—is not “proof” of anything, no matter how much people want to believe it is.

While it is absolutely true that, while being interviewed on Israeli television, Ellner admitted he and his friends were videotaping the event, what Ellner said was hardly a confession to anything.

What he was saying, in answer to a question as to why they were videotaping, was essentially: “The reason why we had a video camera there was to film what was happening.”

So, today, while many 9-11 skeptics are often heard telling friends and family—“I’ve seen the video of Ellner saying those words and admitting he and his buddies knew the attack was going to happen and that’s why they were filming it”—the truth is that what those people have seen (circulated on the Internet) is a brief excerpt from the Israeli television interview (conducted in Hebrew) with an English-language voice-over translating Ellner’s comment into an awkward and stilted declarative sentence that has now been immortalized thusly: “Our purpose was to document the event.”

Now this is not to say that Ellner and the “dancing Israelis” did not have foreknowledge of the impending attacks. As we shall see later, there was *much* more about Ellner and his friends to be unveiled. *But this particular comment has clearly been taken out of context.*

While these young men—and the other Israelis seen videotaping the world trade center from at least one other location—almost assuredly did know in advance of the attacks and had, accordingly, set up their video equipment to “document the event,” the bottom line question is this: *How likely is it that they would have confessed—even by accident—in a television interview conducted before a live audience?*

A few folks—who are so determined to believe that Ellner’s words are indeed some sort of confession—will insist forever that Ellner’s “confession” is proof of Israeli foreknowledge and involvement in 9-11. But it isn’t. It’s another one of those stories that “sound good” but one which open-minded and objective folks interested in alternative views relating to 9-11 can not—and will not—find convincing.

So, with that brief digression into one of the more prominent legends surrounding 9-11, we will set aside the discussion of our Dancing Israeli friends from Urban Moving Systems for the moment.

However, there is much, much more to their story, and we'll come back to them later.

In fact, as it was discovered, there were quite a few more other Israelis operating on American soil and they, too, were taken into custody following 9-11 and at least some of them were suspected by the FBI of possible involvement in the 9-11 tragedy.

In fact—as *American Free Press* reported on Dec. 17—*The Washington Post* had admitted on November 23 that among a total of some 60 young Israeli Jews picked up by the FBI in the wake of the terrorist attacks, there were a handful *actually being held on suspicion of involvement in the terrorist acts of 9-11*.

And remember—this admission came from a leading voice of the “mainstream” media, although, certainly, it was not given wide play in the pages of the *Post* or elsewhere in the media. So the truth is that while *most* of the Israelis arrested and detained since Sept. 11 were held on immigration charges, not suspected of involvement in terrorism, *there were exceptions*. According to *Post* staff writer John Mintz:

In several cases, such as those in Cleveland and St. Louis, INS officials testified in court hearings that they were “of special interest to the government,” a term that federal agents have used in many of the hundreds of cases involving mostly Muslim Arab men who have been detained around the country since the terrorist attacks.

An INS official who requested anonymity said the agency will not comment on the Israelis. He said the use of the term “special interest” means the case in question is “related to the investigation of Sept. 11.”

All of the 60 Israeli detainees, according to the *Post*, were supposedly “observing a time-honored tradition in their country—touring the world after their mandatory service in the Israeli military.” The *Post* said “a number of them had served in counter-terrorist units in Israel.”

Although referring to Israel as a “close U.S. ally in the fight against terrorism,” the *Post* pointed out that one Israeli detainee, Liron Diamant, said that while he and his friends had first been mistaken as Arabs, the FBI still nonetheless conducted an “hours-long” interrogation after their Israeli identity had been determined and that they were “questioned in detail about their Israeli military service.”

Clearly, the fact the young men were Israelis did not preclude the suspicion, on the part of at least some good people in the FBI, that these Israelis might have had a hand in the terrorist attacks, a point that might confound those who believe all American law enforcement and intelligence officials are found firmly in Israel's camp and devoted to the principle that Israel is a valuable ally that would do America no harm.

But the whole Israeli connection to 9-11 went *even further*.

On Dec. 12, the "Special Report With Brit Hume" on Fox News featured reporter Carl Cameron who unveiled a staggering report on a wide-ranging Israeli espionage ring on U.S. soil.

Cameron's report on Fox was so immediately controversial primarily because he asserted flat out there was evidence these Israelis were surveilling the reputed 9-11 terrorists prior to the Sept. 11 tragedy. On Dec. 24, AFP summarized Cameron's report in which he stated in part:

There is no indication the Israelis were involved in the Sept. 11 attacks, but investigators suspect that they may have gathered intelligence about the attacks in advance and not shared it.

A highly-placed investigator told Fox News there are "ties-ins," but when asked for details flatly refused to describe them. [The investigator said:]

"Evidence linking these Israelis to 9-11 is classified. I cannot tell you about evidence that has been gathered. It is classified information."

During the segment, host Brit Hume asked Cameron: "What about this question of advance knowledge of what was going to happen on 9-11? How clear are investigators that some Israeli agents may have known something?" Cameron responded:

It's very explosive information, obviously, and there's a great deal of evidence that they say they have collected. None of it necessarily conclusive.

It's more when they put it all together. A bigger question, they say, is "How could they not have known?" [That is] almost a direct quote [from the investigators].

The Fox report indicated that *prior* to Sept. 11 *as many as 140 other Israelis* had been detained or arrested in what was described by Cameron as "a secretive and sprawling investigation into suspected Israeli espionage."

According to Cameron:

Investigators are focusing part of their efforts on Israelis who said they are art students from the University of Jerusalem or Bezalel Academy and repeatedly made contact with U.S. government personnel by saying they wanted to sell cheap art or handiwork.

Documents say they “targeted” and penetrated military bases, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, dozens of government facilities and even secret offices and unlisted private homes of law enforcement and intelligence personnel.

After the Fox report, there was an angry response from the Israeli lobby in America. The Dec. 21 issue of the Jewish weekly, *Forward*, reported Fox and Cameron were “under fire” from supporters of Israel for having dared to bring the matter to public attention. However, *Forward* also gloated that “the rest of the American media” had “barely noted” the Fox reports.

Whatever the case, Fox News pulled the transcriptions of Cameron’s broadcast reports off its Internet web site under pressure from such groups as the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith, but Cameron told *Forward* he continued to stand behind his story.

Meanwhile, the famed British intelligence and military analysis publication, *Jane’s Information Group*, noted the peculiar absence of reporting in the American media on this matter and commented:

It is rather strange that the U.S. media . . . seem to be ignoring what may well prove to be the most explosive story since the Sept. 11 attack, the alleged breakup of a major Israeli espionage operation in the United States which aimed to infiltrate both the Justice and Defense departments and which may also have been tracking Al-Qaeda terrorists before the aircraft hijackings took place.

So *at the very least*, there was strong evidence that, at the very least, Israeli intelligence operatives on American soil almost certainly had specific advance knowledge of the impending terrorist attacks on the United States but America’s “ally,” Israel, did not report this information to American authorities.

And that alone is an aspect of 9-11 that—for the most part—remains unknown to the broad swath of the American people.

On March 4, 2002, the story on the Israeli “art student” espionage ring popped back up when the French daily, *Le Monde*, carried an update, relying largely on reporting arising from an independent investigation by the Paris-based internet newsletter, *Intelligence Online* (IO), which, in turn, had been directed by the sources made available to Fox.

Citing the work by Fox, *Le Monde* pointed out how Fox refused to cooperate with *Le Monde*, saying it was “a problem,” but that Fox refused to be specific. *Le Monde* noted that IO had received a copy of a report prepared by an officer of the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) and others from the Immigration and Naturalization Service. A spokesman for the DEA, Will Glaspy, confirmed to *Le Monde* that the DEA “holds a copy” of that report.

The DEA document revealed many of the Israelis had addresses in South Florida very close to the homes of Arabs allegedly involved in the 9-11 attacks. For example, the alleged hijacking ringleader, Mohammad Atta, lived at 3389 Sheridan St. in Hollywood, Fla., while a group of the Israelis resided only a few blocks away, at 4220 Sheridan.

On March 5, Reuters reported *Le Monde*’s article (even including the allegation of Israeli foreknowledge of the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks). Reuters, however, cited an un-named FBI spokesman who called it a “bogus story,” saying—despite all the evidence to the contrary—that “there wasn’t a spy ring.”

On March 6, the Associated Press reported the story but did not mention, however, that the Israelis were believed to have had intimate knowledge relating to the 9-11 terrorists.

On March 6, *Washington Post* staff writers John Mintz and Dan Eggen reported that Attorney General Ashcroft’s spokeswoman at the Justice Department, Susan Dryden, dismissed the story as “an urban myth that has been circulating for months.” She added: “The department has no information at this time to substantiate these widespread reports about Israeli art students involved in espionage.”

So it was that, again and again, the specter of Israeli foreknowledge and involvement in the events of 9-11 reared its ugly head. And even the major media was being forced to acknowledge it. But the story of the Dancing Israelis was not about to go away either.

In any event, at long last—as we mentioned at the outset of this chapter—the Jewish newspaper *Forward* finally acknowledged on March 15, 2002 that there was indeed *a Mossad connection* to the strange circumstances surrounding the multiple groups of Israelis (with links to a network of Israeli-controlled moving companies) who were observed acting suspiciously (and then taken into custody) on 9-11. *The young Israelis were, in fact, assets of Israel’s Mossad.*

As a consequence of the new admissions by *Forward*, we learned much more about at least that one specific group of five Israelis connected who were picked up in New Jersey after famously “high fiving” and celebrating the collapse of the World Trade Center as they videotaped the event from the roof of the Israeli-controlled Urban Moving Systems (UMS) company in Weehawken, New Jersey.

The Israelis in question were brothers Paul and Sivan Kurzberg, as well as Omer Marmari, Yaon Shmuel and Oded Ellner, the last of whom made the famous remarks on Israeli television—described earlier—about the intent of Ellner and his colleagues to “document the event.”

According to *Forward*, UMS was “a moving company with few discernable assets” that closed up immediately after the federal authorities began investigating its activities. The owner of UMS, Dominic Otto Suter “fled to Israel” after being questioned by the FBI.

Forward said one of its sources admitted that UMS was a Mossad-connected operation:

According to one former high-ranking American intelligence official, who asked not to be named, the FBI came to the conclusion at the end of its investigation that the five Israelis arrested in New Jersey last September were conducting a Mossad surveillance mission and that their employer, Urban Moving Systems of Weehawken, N.J., served as a front.

After their arrest, the men were held in detention for two-and-a-half months and were deported at the end of November, officially for visa violations.

However, a counterintelligence investigation by the FBI concluded that at least two of them were Mossad operatives, according to the former American official, who said he was regularly briefed on the investigation by two separate law enforcement officials.

“The assessment was that Urban Moving Systems was a front for the Mossad and operatives employed by it,” he said. “The conclusion of the FBI was that they were spying on local Arabs but that they could leave because they did not know anything about 9/11.”

However, he added, the bureau was “very irritated because it was a case of so-called unilateral espionage, meaning they didn’t know about it.”

Forward said the FBI, the Justice Department and the Immigration and Naturalization Service refused to discuss the case.

Forward reported that its source said that after the United States confronted the Israeli government, Israel privately admitted that UMS was a Mossad front. Citing its U.S. intelligence source, *Forward* said:

The nature of the investigation changed after the names of two of the five Israelis showed up on a CIA-FBI database of foreign intelligence operatives, he said. At that point, he said, the bureau took control of the investigation and launched a Foreign Counterintelligence Investigation, or FCI.

FBI investigations into possible links to the Sept. 11 attacks are usually carried by the bureau's counterterrorism division, not its counterintelligence division. "An FCI means not only that it was serious but also that it was handled at a very high level and very tightly," the former official said. That view was echoed by several former FBI officials interviewed.

In fact, it seems, the two specific Mossad assets were the Kurzberg brothers, Paul and Sivan, although, needless to say, the other Israelis were obviously in their sphere of influence and on the payroll of a Mossad front operation. The bottom line is that *American Free Press* had been on the mark from the very beginning. There was indeed a Mossad connection to 9-11, although the article in *Forward*, in many respects, read very much like an attempted cover-up.

The *Forward* recounting of the saga of the five Israelis was woven into a larger story describing controversy surrounding the separate reports of espionage by the so-called Israeli "art students." And although (as noted earlier) a spokesman for Attorney General John Ashcroft had dismissed the "art student" affair as an "urban myth," *Forward* effectively exposed Ashcroft's prevarication, admitting that:

In March 2001, the federal National Counterintelligence Executive issued a warning urging employees to report all contact with people describing themselves as Israeli art students. It said some had gone to private residences of senior U.S. officials under the guise of selling art.

"These individuals have been described as aggressive," the warning said. "They attempt to engage employees in conversation rather than giving a sales pitch." However, the warning added that there may be two groups involved, one with an "apparently legitimate money-making goal while the second, perhaps a non-Israeli group, may have ties to a Middle Eastern Islamic fundamentalist group."

Naturally, *Forward* defended Israel, proclaiming: "Far from pointing to Israeli spying against U.S. government and military facilities . . . the incidents in question appear to represent a case of Israelis in the United States spying on a common enemy, radical Islamic networks suspected of links to Middle East terrorism." *Forward* contended that tensions between the U.S. and Israel arose not because the United States believed the Israelis were spying on Americans but because the Israelis had failed to advise the United States that they were engaged in spying against the Arab terrorists on American soil.

Forward's suggestion that two such groups were operating (and that one may have been a "non-Israeli group" posing as Israelis) was interesting, for it raises the logical counter-question: Was there also group of Israelis operating in the United States *posing as Arabs*—a possibility that, in fact, had first been broached by AFP as far back as Dec. 24, 2001 (a point to be examined in greater detail later in these pages.)

On June 21, 2002, ABC's weekly newsmagazine, "20/20"—featuring hostess Barbara Walters—was forced to acknowledge growing public belief that Israeli intelligence had foreknowledge of—or was perhaps involved in—the 9-11 terrorist attacks, a belief stimulated from awareness of the story of the Dancing Israelis.

In a segment entitled "The White Van," ABC tackled the problematic fact that these several groups of Israeli nationals in the New York-New Jersey area had been taken into custody on suspicion of having been involved in some way with the terrorist attacks.

ABC—of course—never mentioned *American Free Press* (AFP) but it's clear that AFP's considerable outreach stimulated discussion of the story in the first place. However, it is no surprise ABC went into a damage-control mode on Israel's behalf. Those at the highest levels of ABC are, to put it simply, known for their sympathies toward Israel.

ABC's admissions were grudging at best. ABC would not admit flat out, that the Israelis were Mossad operatives. All ABC would say was that was that there were those in official circles in the United States who said the Israelis were Mossad. They said others don't think so.

But if they were Mossad agents, ABC assured the audience, they weren't doing anything against the the United States. At most they were simply monitoring Arab and Muslim groups in the New York-New Jersey area. That was a good thing, ABC explained.

Thus, ABC's presentation sought to refute the evidence and defuse the belief that the Israelis had any involvement in—or even foreknowledge of—the terrorist attack. Barbara Walters summarized the story by liping smugly, "I hope we've put all these wumors to rest."

Not hardly, Barbara.

CHAPTER TWENTY:

The Israelis Who Were (or Were Not) There: How the Jewish-Controlled Media Manipulated the Legend of the 4,000 Israelis (or Jews) Who Were (or Were Not) at the World Trade Center

Although we know for a fact that there were at least several handfuls of Mossad-connected Israelis engaged in strange behavior in the New York City area on 9-11, the Jewish-controlled media in the United States engaged in a remarkable array of manipulative misreporting about claims that some 4,000 Israelis were employed at the World Trade Center (or working in its immediate environs) at the time of the 9-11 attacks but somehow managed to escape death because—it was said—they had been warned in advance and did not appear for work on 9-11.

In fact, there was a great deal of confusion surrounding the story which evidently originated with an Israeli news report immediately after the tragedy which suggested that some 4,000 Israelis were believed to be working in (or near) the World Trade Center. *and* the Pentagon at the time of the attacks.

If anything that story—which was, in fact, highlighted in the major media—seemed to be a “strawman” set up and widely disseminated for the very purpose of being easily knocked down.

And that is precisely what the American media did with this story—much to its own smug satisfaction.

The Anti-Defamation League and other Israeli propaganda outlets frequently cited the story as evidence that “anti-Semites” were spreading anti-Semitic rumors and lies and eagerly pointed out that, in fact, numerous American Jews had, in fact, died in the World Trade Center.

Thus, the Israeli propagandists claimed, there was absolutely no reason to believe that Israel had anything whatsoever to do with orchestrating 9-11 as the evil anti-Semitic rumor-mongers were proclaiming.

However, by the time the story entered the realm of 9-11 debate, many people (here in the United States and around the world) were saying that roughly 4,000 Jews (and/or Israelis) had therefore somehow survived, presumably by having had advance warning (from Israel) that the attacks were about to occur.

This theory was based on the initial claim by President Bush that 130 Israelis had died.

However, in the end, as AFP itself reported, the Israeli embassy confirmed that three Israeli nationals died in the terror attacks, one (as mentioned earlier) in the World Trade Center and two who had been on the airliners used to carry out the attacks.

And consequently, quite naturally, many contended that this number of Israelis dead was suspiciously low considering the fact that the World Trade Center was a major enclave of the financial industry and that it was well-known that Jews (and Israelis) have long been major players in the world of finance. But even that, in and of itself, is purely speculative and really does not prove anything.

However, here's where the more important nuances come into play, however, when considering the controversy surrounding this matter:

The most-often cited so-called "proof" used by the media and Israeli propagandists to discredit the "4,000 Jews" and/or "4,000 Israelis" story—and, quite specifically the suggestion that Jews had advance warning of the impending attacks—is that it is known that some American Jews working in the World Trade Center did die in the tragedy, a fact which no responsible person would deny.

Typical of the comments regarding the rumor were those of a Jewish woman, Suzanne Fields, a strident supporter of Israel, whose Oct. 22, 2001 column in *The Washington Times*. Fields wrote:

One of the stubborn rumors that circulated among Muslims immediately after September 11 (and among certain other Israel-bashers) was that the airplane attacks were initiated by Mossad, the Israeli secret service.

The rumor was accompanied by the kind of lie that lent both specificity and credibility, that 4,000 Jews who worked in the World Trade Center were warned not to show up for work, and escaped the catastrophe.

The rumor was quickly squelched in this country when many of the dead and missing were identified as Jews. But the rumor has the legs of "unshakable truth" for Muslims in the streets of Cairo, Jerusalem, Riyadh, even London.

If anything, Fields' claim that "the rumor was quickly squelched" was really wishful thinking. Fields seemed to be suggesting that theories relating to Mossad responsibility for 9-11 were related to the "lie" that 4,000 Jews did not show up for work at the trade center on 9-11.

In truth, it is highly unlikely that even the Mossad would somehow be able to secretly alert 4,000 Jewish people from all walks of life—working in many different locations in the two WTC towers and their environs—not to come to work on Sept. 11.

There is, however, good reason to believe that at least some Israelis working at the WTC may have had advance warning. For example, the American division of one of Israel's most influential firms, Zim Israel, a

shipping concern founded by longtime Mossad figure Shaul Eisenberg, Israel's richest industrialist, abandoned its office in the WTC just weeks before the Sept. 11 attack.

In addition, two employees at the Israeli marketing division of software designer Odigo received instant email messages warning of an impending attack two hours before the tragedy at the trade towers.

Writing in *The Washington Times* on Oct. 16, Tod Lindberg, a reliable advocate for Israel, complained that to suggest that Israel benefited from the attacks of Sept. 11 was "a species of irrationalism" based on the idea that "there are hidden hands operating everywhere."

However, please recall, as noted earlier in these pages, that it was Lindberg's newspaper that reported in a front-page story one day before the 9-11 attacks that top U.S. Army analysts at the Army's School for Advanced Military Studies believe the Mossad is "ruthless and cunning, a wildcard" that "has [the] capability to target U.S. forces and make it look like a Palestinian/Arab act."

In addition, there was another rumor circulating on the Internet that a U.S. government source had leaked word that the Mossad was a suspect in the crime. The name "David Stern," described as an "expert" on Israeli intelligence, was linked to the report.

The same report said that Stern had reviewed the history of Israeli intelligence operations and concluded that the WTC attacks had the earmark of a Mossad operation. The report was framed in a format designed to appear as though it had been issued by some news service.

In fact, the story was not a news story at all, but a cleverly crafted Internet fraud. While it certainly reflected a very real possibility, the story attributed to "Dave Stern" had been conjured up out of thin air.

In fact—and this is the bottom line:

There is *no connection* between the number of how many American Jews or Israelis did or did not die at the World Trade Center and the question of whether the Mossad was responsible for what was being called an "Arab terrorist" attack.

And as we shall see in Chapter Twenty-Three (and please be patient, as there is much more ground to be covered before that), there is very real evidence that Israel is indeed prepared (on political and religious ideological grounds) to sacrifice Jewish lives (particularly American Jewish lives) if the survival of Israel as a nation is at stake. *And that is an important point that can not be easily dismissed.*

Based on all of this, AFP concluded early on that, in fact, the "4,000 Jews" or "4,000 Israelis" rumor—along with the "David Stern" report—may have been deliberate disinformation to muddy the waters and distort the big picture: the fact that the Mossad *was* responsible for 9-11.

CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE:

Iron-Clad Evidence of Israeli Foreknowledge: The 9-11 Commission Cover-Up of the Mossad's Capacity to Monitor the Activities of Osama bin Laden

Even if—however unlikely—Israel was not the prime mover behind the 9-11 terrorist attacks, there's absolutely no question Israel's Mossad simply had to have had advance knowledge of the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks if, as the official story suggests, Islamic fundamentalists under the discipline (direct or indirect) of Osama bin Laden were responsible for the tragedy. And this, as we shall see, is absolutely critical to understanding, in the end, how Israel was indeed the driving force behind 9-11.

The evidence for this came from post-9-11 revelations about the Inslaw scandal of the 1980s first publicized nationally in *The Spotlight*, but which was carefully suppressed by the Jewish-controlled “mainstream” media in America. Here is the story . . .

As early as Oct. 10, 2001, Britain's *Guardian* quoted the candid remarks of Mohammed Heikal, who has been described as the Arab world's foremost political commentator. No Muslim extremist by any means, Heikal—who was closely associated with the secular Egyptian regime of President Gamal Abdul Nasser—asserted flat out, that, based on his knowledge, there was simply no way that bin Laden and Al-Qaeda could have carried out the 9-11 attacks without U.S. foreknowledge:

bin Laden has been under surveillance for years: every telephone call was monitored and al-Qaeda has been penetrated by American intelligence, Pakistani intelligence, Saudi intelligence, Egyptian intelligence. They could not have kept secret an operation that required such a degree of organization and sophistication.

The truth is that if—as the evidence suggests—alleged 9-11 mastermind Osama bin Laden had access to the Inslaw computer company's PROMIS surveillance software and used it to carry off the Sept. 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, this means without any question that Israel's Mossad, knew all along what bin Laden and/or his lieutenants had in mind.

To understand all of what we are about to outline, a brief digression into the history of Inslaw and the PROMIS software is critical, for the truth is that the fine hand of Israeli intelligence and its influence at the highest levels in Washington is the common thread running through the web of the INSLAW affair, and it ultimately linked directly to 9-11.

It all began in March 1982 when Bill and Nancy Hamilton of Inslaw won a \$10 million three-year contract with the Justice Department, which planned to install the PROMIS software, developed by Mr. Hamilton, in the 22 largest U.S. attorneys' offices and a word-processor version in 72 others.

In the meantime, however, Dr. Earl Brian, a longtime crony of then-Attorney General Edwin Meese, began using his political clout to interfere with the Hamiltons' contract in order to win the contract for a company he owned (after the Hamiltons refused Brian's offer to purchase Inslaw). Brian, with wide-ranging international contacts, was widely believed to be a longtime CIA asset.

In early 1983 the Justice Department arranged with the Hamiltons to demonstrate PROMIS to an Israeli who called himself "Dr. Ben Orr" and who purported to be representing the Israeli Ministry of Justice. "Ben Orr" said he was most impressed with PROMIS, but, to the Hamiltons' surprise, he never bought the product.

It was only later the Hamiltons learned why: Using his contacts inside the Justice Department, Brian had illicitly provided the software to LEKEM, a top-secret signals intelligence unit of the Israeli Defense Force. The head of LEKEM was longtime Mossad operative Rafael Eitan who was actually the "Dr. Ben Orr" who had visited the Hamiltons.

It was later revealed that Eitan was also the Mossad official directing the American spying operations of Israeli spy Jonathan Pollard. In fact, Eitan's LEKEM operations had been covertly funded by a series of off-shore corporations in the Bahamas that had been set in place some years before by the law firm of Burns and Summit.

This just happened to be the firm of Deputy Attorney General Arnold Burns, the key player in the campaign to dislodge Federal Bankruptcy Judge Bason who had ruled against the Justice Department after the Hamiltons had brought suit against the department for its misappropriation of the PROMIS software—a long and tangled tale in and of itself, far too complicated to delve into in these pages.

A powerful attorney with long-standing ties to the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith, Burns was also a founder of "Nesher," a quietly influential group of some 300 high-ranking federal officials and bureaucrats who were, at that time (and probably still today) meeting regularly, bound together by a desire to advance Israel's cause.

Israeli intelligence operative Ari Ben-Menashe has said that PROMIS was perfect software for use by Israeli intelligence in tracking the Palestinian and political dissidents critical of Israel. He said: "PROMIS was . . . probably the most important issue of the 1980s because it just changed the whole intelligence outlook."

In fact, it appears that Brian also sold PROMIS to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the Canadian Security and Intelligence Service and to Jordanian military intelligence, among many others. So, in truth, the full extent of Brian's intrigue in dealing PROMIS worldwide has yet to be told—but the Israeli connection has always been the key to understanding the intrigue surrounding the Inslaw affair from the beginning.

It was only in 2003—well after the 9-11 attacks—that Bill Hamilton, the founder of Inslaw, came forth, calling for the new “independent” commission investigating 9-11 to look into evidence that bin Laden may have gained access to PROMIS. Hamilton said, in pertinent part:

bin Laden reportedly bought the U.S. intelligence community's version of the PROMIS database software on the Russian black market, after former FBI Agent Robert P. Hanssen had stolen it for the Russians, and used PROMIS in computer-based espionage against the United States.

The national commission may wish to examine whether the Justice Department's misappropriation of PROMIS was, at a minimum, linked indirectly to pre-September 11 performance problems of U.S. intelligence.

Hamilton noted that although the FBI and other federal agencies had initially denied they had used the PROMIS software, he pointed out that on Oct. 16, 2001 the FBI, for example, admitted that it had, in fact, used PROMIS to track classified information in federal law enforcement and intelligence agencies, despite the legal controversy surrounding the misappropriation of the software. (Of course, however, the FBI continued to deny any wrongdoing in the Inslaw affair.)

In any case, taking Hamilton's basic allegations on their face, anyone with knowledge of the history of the theft of PROMIS or of the so-called “Russian black market” cannot help but recognize the obvious: Israel's central positioning in the Inslaw affair throughout its sordid history.

Here is the key to understanding how Israel could have been—and most assuredly was—tracking bin Laden:

In reporting Hamilton's allegations, *The Washington Times* pointed out that by having control of PROMIS, bin Laden would not only be able to monitor U.S. efforts to track him, but that it would also have given bin Laden access to the computer databases of other nations' intelligence services and financial institutions, what the *Times* did *not* mention is that—because of a “trapdoor” installed in PROMIS —anyone using the software (including bin Laden) would have likewise had their own activities monitored by those from whom the software had been received.

The fact this “trapdoor” existed was first documented nationally by *The Spotlight* and later in *American Free Press*, based on Tom Valentine’s pioneering Inslaw coverage on his *Radio Free America*.

In the meantime, in his book, *Seeds of Fire*, British journalist Gordon Thomas filled in many missing pieces of the puzzle, in particular the central role of British-based press lord, Robert Maxwell—a longtime Mossad asset—in marketing the PROMIS software around the world.

Then, in a follow-up book on Maxwell, entitled *Israel’s Superspy: The Life and Murder of a Media Mogul*, Thomas and his co-author, Martin Dillon, provided further devastating details, including revelations concerning Maxwell’s intrigue with the very “Russian” criminals now implicated in the distribution of PROMIS to bin Laden. And make no mistake about it: the “Russian” connection points directly to Israel.

Although the term “Russian black market” raises the specter of “the Russian Mafia” and “Russian organized crime,” the fact is that the so-called “Russians” in this network are largely not of Russian ethnic origin (they are Jews) and many indeed have dual Russian-Israeli citizenship.

In fact, according to the late Robert I. Friedman, writing in his book *Red Mafiya*, one of the leading figures in the syndicate, Shabtai Kalmanovitch, was also an operative for Israel’s Mossad.

In addition, Friedman pointed out, other figures in the “Russian” syndicate, such as Joseph Kobson, have close political ties with (indeed strong influence over) the “right wing” Likud political bloc in Israel. And Likud—of course—is the political party of former Israeli prime minister Ariel Sharon who was in power at the time of the 9-11 attacks.

Friedman’s indictment of Israel’s entwinement—as a nation—with the “Russian” mob is telling indeed. Friedman wrote:

With two decades of unimpeded growth, the Russian Mafiya has succeeded in turning Israel into its very own, “mini-state,” in which it operates with virtual impunity.

Although many in international law enforcement believe that Israel is by now so compromised that its future as a nation is imperiled, its government, inexplicably, has done almost nothing to combat the problem.

Friedman pointed out that U.S. law enforcement—including the FBI—actually did little to impede the growth of the “Russian” crime syndicate while it was establishing itself on American soil. The reason he said: “A large part of the problem was political: the Russian mob was predominantly Jewish.” Friedman revealed that as far back as 1992, an FBI spokesman, Joe Valiquette admitted that “The Russian Mafia has the low-

est priority on the criminal pecking order.” Concurrently, Patrick Cotter, one of the Justice Department prosecutors who nailed famed Italian-American crime figure John Gotti, frankly admitted to Friedman that “if we don’t begin to address the problem now, we’ll be running around asking ourselves how the Hell this Russian organized crime got so big and how we can get rid of them.”

Cotter noted that while the FBI had squads targeting the declining Italian-American “crime families” there was no squad targeting the “Russian” crime figures. “There is your problem,” he said.

Why the FBI never moved against these mobsters is no mystery to anyone familiar with the history of the FBI. As many have long been aware, the top leadership of the FBI—since well before World War II—actively collaborated quite closely with the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith in “dirty tricks” operations against American nationalists. In 1948, after the founding of the state of Israel, the ADL then began acting as an adjunct and asset-in-place of Israel’s Mossad.

The late former U.S. Attorney General Elliot Richardson, while serving as attorney for Inslaw’s owners, discovered that it was specifically the Office of Special Investigations (OSI)—the so-called “nazi hunting division” of the Justice Department—that was responsible for the theft of the PROMIS software. Richardson also charged that the OSI operated a secret covert-operations intelligence unit inside the Justice Department, involved in assassinations and other operations designed to silence American political dissidents.

Since it is no secret that the OSI also worked closely with the Mossad, it is accurate to say that the OSI (and the secret unit inside OSI) were acting as Mossad assets. All of this happened under the very eyes of the FBI’s inspector general and others responsible for protecting American national security.

This is particularly relevant inasmuch as at the time the Inslaw scandal was coming into the open, *The Spotlight* newspaper led the media in publicizing the affair. A Justice Department attorney later promoted to a federal judgeship in return for his services on behalf of the Mossad-linked OSI thieves—S. Martin Teel—later issued the controversial court ruling that destroyed *The Spotlight*.

The story of Inslaw is told in further detail in this author’s previous work, *The New Jerusalem*.

Putting two and two together in the intertwined cases of Inslaw and 9-11 does certainly point toward a central Israeli connection, but we certainly didn’t hear about any of that in the American media. And the “independent” commission appointed by President George W. Bush to “investigate” 9-11 didn’t delve into it either.

And at this juncture it's probably worth pointing out that, early on, in the formative stages of the dubious "investigation" into 9-11 by United States government personnel, Israeli intrigues designed to direct (or, mis-direct) the course of the investigation were readily apparent but carefully suppressed by the media—with the notable exception of a report appearing in the May 20, 2002 issue of *American Free Press*.

In question was the sudden resignation by L. Britt Snider as staff director of the joint House and Senate intelligence committee investigation of the 9-11 attacks.

What makes the little-noticed Snider affair quite interesting is that only a month before his resignation, Snider's work was being praised by Sen. Bob Graham (D-Fla.) and Rep. Porter J. Goss (R-Fla.), the chairmen, respectively, of the Senate and House intelligence committees.

For its own part, even *The Washington Post* admitted on April 30, 2002 Snider's departure was "setting back the inquiry into the intelligence community's failure to detect or prevent the worst terrorist operation in U.S. history."

While the major media dismissed Snider's resignation as a "personal matter"—possibly involving "a second individual"—AFP explored the matter more carefully and, considering the background to the affair, concluded that Snider had actually been forced out, that there was intrigue afoot behind the scenes designed to dislodge him and that the "personal matter" had been utilized to accomplish that end.

The truth is the beginning, the primary opposition to Snider's tenure at the congressional 9-11 inquiry came from the Israeli lobby.

At the time Snider was appointed, one of the Israeli lobby's chief Washington voices, Frank Gaffney Jr., president of the Center for Security Policy (CSP), bitterly attacked Snider.

A functionary for the CSP's founder, Israeli lobby kingpin William Kristol, a leading American advocate for the hard-line policies of the Sharon and Netanyahu factions in Israel, Gaffney—himself once described as being associated with "extreme right-wing Israeli causes"—asserted that Snider's appointment "sets the stage for a whitewash of epic proportions" and charged Snider's close professional relationship with CIA Director George Tenet was a conflict of interest.

Sen. Richard Shelby (R-Ala.), another of Israel's stalwart allies, was also a vocal Tenet critic and may have played a part in the intrigue that resulted in the departure of Tenet's ally, Snider, from his post. Shelby joined the chorus attempting to place the blame for the oft-discussed "intelligence breakdown" on the CIA, lending credence to the idea that the CIA had failed to carefully track Osama bin Laden and therefore allowed "Islamic fundamentalists" to orchestrate 9-11.

Why such concern about Tenet from the advocates of Israel? It may have something to do with the fact that the Israeli lobby had *long* been hostile to Tenet.

The late international correspondent Andrew St. George pointed out in *The Spotlight* that the Israeli lobby had always adjudged Tenet to be part of a forceful element inside the American military, intelligence and diplomatic communities that remained suspicious of Israel despite Israel's otherwise heavy-handed influence among "bought and paid for" politicians on Capitol Hill.

And contrary to a popular myth which reigns today on the Internet, Tenet is not Jewish. He is actually of Greek Orthodox Christian extraction. Here, in fact, is where the myth of Tenet being Jewish originated:

On November 19, 1995, a *Parade* magazine cover photo of Tenet—along with two of his colleagues at the CIA who were Jewish, Director John Deutch and Executive Director Nora Slatkin—was wrongly misidentified by *Parade* as another of his CIA colleagues, David Cohen another Jew who was mentioned in *Parade's* story about "the New CIA."

As a consequence of that error, many people to this day believe Tenet is Jewish and that he is therefore enamored with Israel. And although *Parade* corrected its error in its subsequent weekly edition, that correction went largely unnoticed.

In any case, it's very clear that Israel's partisans were determined to have a lock onto any and all inquiries into the origins of 9-11. And likewise, in the period that followed, any allegations of Israeli involvement were met with howls of denial in the Controlled Media.

However, as we proceed, we will find (again and again) that there is good solid information that not only demonstrates that Israel was indeed the prime mover behind 9-11 and that, when all is said and done, we will have a reasonable and likely scenario (based on a wide-ranging array of information coming from notably disparate sources) that proves that controversial contention.

CHAPTER TWENTY-TWO:

A “September Surprise” for George W. Bush?

Although it's become an article of faith among 9-11 dissidents that then-President George W. Bush simply had to have had foreknowledge of the impending 9-11 attacks, that thesis—as exciting though it may be—doesn't take into consideration a number of nuances that, quite the contrary, might suggest that Bush was as taken by surprise by the horrific events as the rest of the American people.

An interesting counter-perspective in this regard came shortly after the 9-11 attacks from General Hameed Gul, the still highly influential former director general of the Pakistani intelligence services, when he—Gul—gave a fascinating interview to Arnaud de Borchgrave, UPI's international editor at large, providing perceptive insights into 9-11 that could only come from someone with his contacts and “insider” knowledge of global affairs.

Having worked closely for many years with the CIA in the American agency's efforts to drive the Soviets out of Afghanistan—the movement that launched Osama bin Laden in the first place—Gul was no peripheral minor player easily dismissed. What Gul said about Sept. 11 deserves consideration.

Gul did not believe Osama bin Laden (whom he knew) was responsible, but he did say that if there was genuine evidence implicating bin Laden, that such evidence should be brought forth. Gul noted the media's role in hyping the widespread theory implicating bin Laden:

Within 10 minutes of the second twin tower being hit in the World Trade Center, CNN said Osama bin Laden had done it. That was a planned piece of disinformation by the real perpetrators. It created an instant mindset and put public opinion into a trance, which prevented even intelligent people from thinking for themselves.

In Gul's judgment, while bin Laden was now actually revered by many in the Muslim world, the Saudi millionaire was a *spiritual* leader—not a military commander or tactician. Bin Laden, said Gul, simply “doesn't have the means for such a sophisticated operation” of the type that took place on Sept. 11.

If bin Laden was not responsible for what happened on Sept. 11, then who was responsible?

Gul believed that Israel's intelligence agency, the Mossad, orchestrated the attacks of Sept. 11 and that the Mossad carried off the opera-

tion with the support of a cadre of its own assets—traitors to America—inside the U.S. defense establishment (probably in the U.S. Air Force, in particular). Here is exactly what Gul said:

Mossad and its American associates are the obvious culprits. Who benefits from the crime?

The attacks against the twin towers started at 8:45 am and four flights are diverted from their assigned air space and no air traffic controller sounds the alarm. And no Air Force jets scramble until 10 am.

That also smacks of a small scale Air Force rebellion, a coup against the Pentagon perhaps? Radars are jammed, transponders fail. No IFF [identification of friend or foe] challenge.

In Pakistan, if there is no response to IFF, jets are instantly scrambled and the aircraft is shot down with no further questions asked.

This was clearly an inside job. Bush was afraid and rushed to the shelter of a nuclear bunker. He clearly feared a nuclear situation. Who could that have been?

Will that also be hushed up in the investigation, like the Warren report after the Kennedy assassination?

Why was Bush a target?

Gul asserted that Israel and its American lobby hated both former President Bush and current President George W. Bush, because the father and son are considered “too close to oil interests and the [Arab] Gulf countries.”

At this juncture, let us stop for a moment.

Today years later, in distant retrospect, Gul’s comments might sound a bit of a stretch, considering the ardent pro-Israel stance of George W. Bush and the manipulation of his administration by the Zionist neo-conservative element, bear in mind that at the time Gul was making these assertions the younger Bush had, in fact, been under fire from some hard-line pro-Israel elements who had been feverishly asserting that his administration had not been pro-Israel enough.

Even fanatically religious pro-Israel zealot, Sen. James Inhofe (R-Okla.) had risen to the floor of the Senate on March 4, 2002, to declare that God allowed terrorists to attack the United States on Sept. 11 to punish America for being too tough on Israel.

In a speech condemning his fellow Republican, President Bush, who then was perceived to be pressing too hard on Israel, Inhofe stated in no uncertain terms:

One of the reasons I believe the spiritual door was opened for an attack against the United States of America is that the policy of our government has been to ask the Israelis, and demand it with pressure, not to retaliate in a significant way against the terrorist strikes that have been launched against them.

Although American broadcast media had previously attacked speakers from the Muslim world who had suggested, in one fashion or another, that the Sept. 11 attack on the United States was the will of God, there was hardly a mention anywhere of Inhofe's inflammatory remarks. It certainly did not receive the attention it should have.

In any case, as a consequence, George W. Bush was considered by Israel, in Gul's words, "a potential danger to Israel." Gul opined that the Israelis "made sure Bush senior didn't get a second term. His land-for-peace pressure in Palestine didn't suit Israel."

Gul contends Israel's suspicions about the younger Bush were further exacerbated by the fact, he said, that Arab sources (through American conduits) funnelled some \$150 million into Bush's 2000 presidential campaign, arranged by former President Bush and former Secretary of State Jim Baker.

In addition, according to Gul, former President Bush and Baker, as private citizens, arranged the new strategic relationship between Saudi Arabia and Iran. "I have this from sources in both countries," stated the former Pakistani intelligence chief.

"Jews were stunned by the way Bush stole the election in Florida. They had put big money on Al Gore," said Gul, who evidently believed that President Bush, rather than take on the Mossad on Sept. 11, decided to turn the tables on his Israeli enemies and make the best of a bad situation. (In other words, Bush was turning a lemon into lemonade or making a silk purse out of a sow's ear, as they say). Gul added this:

Israel has now handed the Bush family the opportunity it has been waiting for to consolidate America's imperial grip on the Gulf and acquire control of the Caspian basin by extending its military presence in Central Asia.

Bush conveniently overlooks—or is not told—the fact that Islamic fundamentalists got their big boost in the modern age as CIA assets in the covert campaign I was also involved with to force the Soviets out of Afghanistan.

All summer long we heard about America's shrinking surplus and that the Pentagon would not have sufficient funds to modernize for the 21st century. And now, all of a sudden, the

Pentagon can get what it wants without any Democratic Party opposition. How very convenient.

Even [America's] cherished civil liberties can now be abridged with impunity to protect the expansion of the hegemony of transnational capitalism. There is now a new excuse to crush anti-globalization protests.

"Bush 43" [George W. Bush] follows "Bush 41" [Bush's father]: Iraq was baited into the Kuwaiti trap when the U.S. told Saddam it was not interested in his inter-Arab squabbles. Two days later, he moved into Kuwait, which was an Iraqi province anyway before the British Empire decreed otherwise.

Roosevelt baited the Pearl Harbor trap for the Japanese empire, which provided the pretext for entering World War II.

And now the Israelis have given the U.S. the pretext for further expansion into an area that will be critical in the next 25 years—the Caspian basin.

Gul acknowledged his own hostility to former President George H. W. Bush, pointing out that when Bush became president he issued an order to "clip the wings" of Pakistani intelligence (of which Gul was then director general) which had been coordinating the entire anti-Soviet effort in Afghanistan. Gul also said that he was blocked for promotion because of pressure by the U.S. Until then, he says, "We were all pro-American. But then America left us in the lurch and everything went to pieces, including Afghanistan."

According to Gul, it was U.S. policy, after the collapse of the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, that led to the rise of the Taliban which was then being targeted for destruction by the "Dubya" Bush administration:

The U.S. pushed for a broad-based Afghan government of seven factions and then waved goodbye. Even in the best of democracies, a broad-based coalition does not work. So we quickly had seven jokers in Kabul interested only in one thing, jockeying for power. The gunplay quickly followed, which led to the creation of Taliban, the students of the original Mujahideen, who decided to put an end to it.

Gul was critical of influential geopolitical strategists such as Samuel Huntington who, in his widely-touted anti-Muslim screed, *The Clash of Civilizations*, "puts Confucius and Judeo-Christians in one corner, and us [Muslims] in the other." This, Gul said, "is the diabolical school that wants to launch an anti-Muslim 'crusade.'"

Instead, according to Gul:

We need a meeting—not a clash—of civilizations. We are on the brink of disaster. It is time to pull back from the brink and reassess before we blow ourselves up. The purpose of Islam is service to humanity. The time for like-minded people to have a meeting of the minds is now.

When Gul asserted his informed opinion that President Bush himself believed at one point on Sept. 11 that traitors, perhaps within the Air Force, had played a part in the hijackings and suggested that these traitors were part of a more wide-ranging attempt at a *coup d'état* orchestrated by Bush-hating partisans of Israel, critics dismissed Gul as a Muslim sympathizer of Osama bin Laden, failing to point out Gul's actual comments presented Bush himself as an effective victim (or potential actual *physical* victim) of the events of 9-11.

However, in its Dec. 31/Jan. 7, 2002 issue, *Newsweek* revealed that on Sept. 11, a military officer in the White House communications room announced a threat had been received against the president's plane, Air Force One. When the top aide to the vice president's chief of staff asked, "How do we know?," according to *Newsweek*, the officer replied that the warning included the aircraft's code name, which is classified.

According to *Newsweek*, "The threat was almost surely bogus—though to this day White House officials say they do not know where it came from." *Newsweek* quoted White House National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice as saying, "I don't think we'll ever know," where the threat came from.

Newsweek also reported there was also another report from the Federal Aviation Administration of another plane—about 30 seconds away—heading straight for Washington. Yet, said *Newsweek*: "The plane was a phantom of the fog of war; it never existed." Or did it?

Again, these are the kind of questions that have been raised about what did—and didn't—happen on 9-11. And many of them, while, quite naturally, are simply the result of bad "on-the-spot" reporting, a phenomenon that always plagues broad-ranging events of this kind, the complete record of 9-11 demonstrates that, in fact, the record is actually hardly complete at all and that, as American Free Press asserted time and time again, there were just too many "unanswered questions."

However, the thesis put forth by General Gul—although widely suppressed or otherwise ignored—does tend to point toward the very likelihood that, contrary to what many 9-11 "truthers" want to think, it is not beyond the realm of possibility that on 9-11 George W. Bush was just as

taken by surprise by what happened and that, as Gul suggested, Bush himself may well have been one of the targets for elimination that day.

And at this juncture, it's probably worth noting my own personal discussion regarding 9-11 with one of the highest-ranking figures in the Arab world, a conversation which took place during my visit, in March of 2003, to Abu Dhabi in the United Arab Emirates where I had been invited to lecture at the Zayed Centre for Coordination and Follow-Up, at the time the officially-designated think tank of the Arab League.

I spent some four hours alone with Sheik Sultan, the chairman of the Zayed Centre, at his remarkable palace in Abu Dhabi. The London-educated prince, the second son of then-ruling Sheik Zayed and also the deputy prime minister, described his "shock" at how, in the post-9-11 era, the United States, in his view, had begun acting as an imperial power as the American media and U.S. government policy-makers were now promoting a "clash of civilizations" (a theme, by the way, first enunciated by a longtime Zionist theoretician, Bernard Lewis).

Following the Cold War, the sheik said, he believed that there was arising a genuine opportunity for world cooperation and that the United States would play a front-line role therein. Instead, in the wake of 9-11, the Arab and Muslim world had now become the new "enemy"—a new foundation, a new excuse, for U.S. military adventurism abroad.

Of 9-11 specifically, Sheik Sultan said: "The crime of September 11 could not have come about without the support of a state apparatus. The militant training camps of Osama bin Laden's al-Qaeda simply did not have the capacity to carry off a crime of this magnitude." The implication, of course, was that the 9-11 terrorists were assisted by others.

The sheik pointed out, quite notably, that he had been a student in London at the time of many Irish Republican Army attacks on British installations and noted that, based on his own considerable knowledge of bin Laden and the vaunted Al-Qaeda network, that Al-Qaeda's capacities were essentially at the same relatively basic level of that of the IRA and quite simply not capable of having carried off the 9-11 attacks.

Sheik Sultan referenced the similarity between the actual consequence of the 9-11 attacks and what had been the *intended* consequence of Israel's attack on the *U.S.S. Liberty* wherein the American ship was deliberately attacked in the Mediterranean by the Israelis on June 7, 1967, with the deaths of 34 Americans and the wounding of 172 others.

"We all remember the *Liberty*," said the sheik, pointing out that if the *Liberty* had been sunk with the loss of all aboard, as the Israelis certainly intended, this attack—a classic false flag—would have been (and almost was) blamed on Egypt and served as the provocation for a U.S. attack on Egypt and the Arab states.

Only the dedicated efforts by the wounded men on the *Liberty's* crew saved the ship. And only at the last minute did the United States discover that Israel was the guilty party—just as an American nuclear attack on Cairo was about to be set in motion.

The shocking details surrounding this Israeli false flag have been unveiled in Peter Hounam's remarkable book, *Operation Cyanide*. And it is of more than passing interest to note—in light of what we have already explored in these pages about the JFK assassination—that it was, according to Hounam's findings, Israel's man in place at the CIA, James J. Angleton, who played a pivotal role in setting up the *Liberty* for the intended "false flag" attack by his friends in Israel.

But Sheik Sultan was hardly alone in thinking that there was much more to the 9-11 attacks.

During my presentation at the Zayed Centre itself, I had been asked directly as to whether I viewed bin Laden as a tool of the CIA, a view that, in fact, was quite common in the Arab world, a point that may surprise many in the West. Many Arab diplomats, journalists and others with whom I spoke expressed the suspicion that if, in fact, bin Laden had played some part in orchestrating 9-11 that he had done so acting at the direction of the CIA and/or the Mossad.

Noting that this was, as I said, a "very complex" question, I pointed out that whether bin Laden was a knowing or un-knowing tool of the CIA and the Mossad, the fact remained that U.S. policy toward the Arab and Muslim worlds would have ultimately caused the creation of a bin Laden-type character even if bin Laden himself had never existed.

For his own part, the aforementioned Sheik Sultan pointed out to me, quite notably, that:

Here in the Middle East, we never knew bin Laden until after Sept. 11. We only heard of him, and he only gained great recognition, as a result of the publicity he received in the American media.

The sheik was not suggesting, of course, that neither he nor other Arab leaders (or the broader "Arab street") had never heard of bin Laden.

What he was saying that that—prior to the mass media's focus on bin Laden after 9-11—bin Laden had never been of any substantial political consequence, that he was a virtual unknown with no significant following. Until that time, most people in what the media now commonly refer to as "the Arab street" had never even heard of Bin Laden.

It was the Jewish-controlled media that made bin Laden a virtual overnight international celebrity who gained what popularity he did

achieve precisely because bin Laden—having been accused of responsibility for 9-11—was seen as a counterbalance to the power of Israel and not—as the average American might think—because bin Laden’s Islamic fundamentalism holds such a spell over the Muslim world.

A secondary consequence of all of this, likewise, was that the media’s focus on bin Laden led many Americans to believe bin Laden was—and had been—a major player in the Arab and Muslim world when, in fact, he had not been. And this, of course, played right into the hands of the Israeli intriguers and their collaborators on American soil who hoped to stoke up American support for Israel and opposition to Israel’s perceived enemies in the Arab world.

The truth is, of course, that bin Laden was as certainly hostile to the ruling regimes in Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Egypt, Libya—and even Iraq—along with the other Arab states as he was to the United States. Despite that, thanks to the Jewish-controlled media, Americans wrongly perceived bin Laden to represent the attitude of the entire Arab world toward the United States and the West.

With that in mind, Arab leaders know full well that it has been a long-standing policy on the part of Israel to keep the Arab world destabilized—“Balkanized”—to put a European twist on the concept.

Thus, bin Laden and his Al-Qaeda operations played a major part in fulfilling that geopolitical aim on the part of Israel and its American allies. By keeping the Arab states off balance, this has provided Israel the opportunity to continue to expand its influence, if not its very borders.

So the “idea” of Osama bin Laden—as opposed to the “reality”—has been a useful tool for those who did orchestrate 9-11, especially since it is abundantly clear that Osama bin Laden did not.

In fact, in this realm, it is fitting to conclude with the remarkable assessment of 9-11 put forth in 2006 by former high-ranking Russian military figure General Leonid Ivashov.

Then the vice-president of the Russian Academy on Geopolitical Affairs, Ivashov had previously served as the chief of the department for general affairs in the Soviet Union’s ministry of defense, secretary of the council of defense ministers of the Community of Independent states (CIS), chief of the military cooperation department at the Russian federation’s ministry of defense and—most notably, on 9-11 itself—the chief of staff of the Russian armed forces.

Here is what Ivashov wrote:

1. The organizers of [the 9-11] attacks were the political and business circles interested in destabilizing the world order and who had the means necessary to finance the operation.

The political conception of this action matured in the face of emerging tensions in the administration of financial and other types of resources.

We have to look for the reasons of the attacks in the coincidence of interests of Big Capital at global and transnational levels, in the circles that were not satisfied with the rhythm of the globalization process or its direction.

Unlike traditional wars, whose conception is determined by generals and politicians, the oligarchs and politicians were the ones who did it this time.

2. Only secret services and their current chiefs, or those retired but still with influence inside the state organizations, have the ability to plan, organize and conduct an operation of such magnitude.

Generally, secret services create, finance and control extremist organizations.

Without the support of secret services, these organizations cannot exist, let alone carry out operations of such magnitude inside countries so well protected. Planning and carrying out an operation on this scale is extremely complex.

3. Osama bin Laden and "Al-Qaeda" cannot be the organizers nor the performers of the September 11 attacks. They do not have the necessary organization, resources or leaders. Thus, a team of professionals had to be created, and the Arab kamikazes are just extras to mask the operation.

Ivashov concluded: "The September 11 operation modified the course of events in the world in the direction chosen by transnational mafias and international oligarchs; that is, those who hope to control the planet's natural resources, the world information network and financial flows. This operation also favored the US economic and political elite that also seeks world dominance."

Although Ivashov did not use the word "Mossad," of course, his assessment 1) most definitely runs contrary to the "official" version of what happened on 9-11; 2) incorporates much of the thinking about 9-11 that we have seen in the comments of the aforementioned General Gul of Pakistan and of Sheik Zayed of Abu Dhabi; and 3) does indeed point toward the Mossad—in its role as a key force in the arsenal of the "transnational mafias and international oligarchs"—as a key player behind the terror that rained (and reigned) upon America on 9-11.

Let us now move forward and examine precisely the means by which the Mossad's historic template for terror was utilized on 9-11.

CHAPTER TWENTY-THREE:

Pondering the Unthinkable: Were Those Hijackers Really Arabs or Were They Really Israeli “Mista’Arvim”?

On Dec. 24, 2001, writing in *American Free Press*, I put forth an alternative theory relating to 9-11 that—in the end—resulted in some international political reverberations. Right up front, in my article for AFP, I asked these provocative questions: Were those hijackers really Arabs? Would Israeli agents carry out a suicide mission that could cost American Jewish lives? My article challenged readers of AFP to consider some little-known facts:

In 1986 the New York-based leader of the terrorist Jewish Defense League, Victor Vancier, gave a prophetic hint of what may have been finally played out on Sept. 11, 2001:

If you think the Shiites in Lebanon are capable of fantastic acts of suicidal terrorism, the Jewish underground will strike targets that will make Americans gasp: “How could Jews do such things?”

According to Vancier—quoted by Robert I. Friedman in *The Village Voice* on May 6, 1986—his allies were “desperate people” who “don’t care if they live or die.”

Considering this warning it is entirely conceivable the “Middle Eastern” men purportedly described by the ill-fated passengers on the 9-11 airliners were not Arabs at all.

In fact, these hijackers could well have been Israeli-sponsored fundamentalist Jewish fanatics (posing as “bin Laden Arabs”) hoping to instigate an all-out war U.S. war against the Arab world.

“Jewish suicide bombers? Impossible!” the critics cried.

However, the fact is that there has been a “suicide tradition” that is much-revered part of Jewish history—going back to the famous mass suicide at Masada (however apocryphal) by Jewish zealots.

But in modern times, Israeli suicide missions have indeed been undertaken by officers of Israeli intelligence.

In *The Other Side of Deception* former Mossad officer Victor Ostrovsky described one 1989 venture: the participants were “all volunteers” advised that there was effectively “no possibility of rescue should they be caught.” *And that is a suicide mission, by any definition.*

What about the Arabic language heard on one airplane’s black box? Some naive critics of my thesis immediately pointed out that the hijackers spoke Arabic., proving they were Arabs, not nice Jewish boys on a

highly-unlikely suicide mission on behalf of Israel's survival.

However, those critics failed to consider a formerly secret CIA assessment, *Israel: Foreign Intelligence and Security Services*, dated March 1979, which reported that it had been a long-standing policy for Israeli intelligence to disguise Jews as Arabs:

One of the established goals of the intelligence and security services is that each officer be fluent in Arabic.

A nine-month, intensive Arabic language course is given annually . . . to students . . .

As further training, these Mossad officers work in the [Israeli-controlled Arab lands] for two years to sharpen their language skills. . . .

Many Israelis have come from Arab countries where they were born and educated and appear more Arab than Israeli . . .

By forging passports and identity documents of Arab and western countries and providing sound background legends and cover, Mossad has successfully sent into Egypt and other Arab countries Israelis disguised and documented as Arabs or citizens of European countries. . . .

These persons are also useful for their ability to pass completely for a citizen of the nation in question.

The Israeli talent for counterfeiting or forging foreign passports and documents ably supports the agent's authenticity.

And note this: Famed Pulitzer Prize-winner Jack Anderson—a vocal supporter of Israel and by no means an anti-Semitic conspiracy theorist—wrote in his syndicated column on Sept. 17, 1972 that:

Israeli agents—immigrants whose families had lived in Arab lands for generations—have a perfect knowledge of Arab dialects and customs. They have been able to infiltrate Arab governments with ease.

Or consider this revelation from Israeli journalist, Yossi Melman, writing—on Sept. 29, 1998 in Israel's *Ha'aretz*—of the intrigues of Israel's domestic intelligence service, the Shin Bet:

Shin Bet agents, who worked undercover in the Israeli-Arab sector in the 1950s, went as far as to marry Muslim women and have children with them, in an attempt to continue their mission without raising suspicion.

Melman and his co-author, Dan Raviv, writing in their book, *Spies Against Armageddon: Inside Israel's Secret Wars*, described this Shin Bet mission in detail:

In 1952, Shin Bet formed a highly secret unit of young Jews who were trained to behave as Arabs and live in Arab towns and neighborhoods in Israel.

They were given fake identities and planted in such places as Nazareth and Jaffa to be the eyes and ears of the Shin Bet. Their bosses called them "*mista'arvim*," coining a new word by combining *mistavim* (Hebrew for "masqueraders") and *Aravim* (the word for "Arabs").

One of the main goals was to have trusted Israelis on the inside, in case a war were to break out and Israeli Arabs were to join the enemy.

Shmuel "Sami" Moriah, a senior Shin Bet officer who came to Israel from Iraq and had plenty of experience smuggling Jews out of his native country, led the unit. He recruited 10 other Iraqi-born men for this highly demanding mission.

With detailed cover stories about returning to Palestine after fleeing abroad in the 1948 war, they were sent into Arab villages and cities. Their genuine parents, siblings, and friends in Israel were kept in the dark about their whereabouts and activities.

These Shin Bet agents became so integrated in community life that it was fully expected by neighbors and village elders that they would get married—and most of them did.

Moriah said that he left the decision to each man, but "it seemed suspicious that young vigorous men would stay alone, without a spouse. When we sent them on the mission we didn't order them to marry, but it was clear to both sides that there is such an expectation, and that it would help the job they were doing."

The elders introduced them to eligible young Arab women. They had the brief courtship typical in conservative Arab societies. And most of the 10 men married, not ever telling their wives that they were Jewish Israelis.

As time passed, the intelligence from this daring deception proved to be almost worthless. Shin Bet wanted to call off the mission. But now Shin Bet had a tough problem.

"The double life they were living cost them a lot, emotionally," said [Shin Bet Director Amos] Manor, who created this

project but then backed away after seven years. “I saw that the price is not worth it and decided to put an end to it.”

The unit was disbanded by 1959, but the ramifications haunted Shin for years. The Muslim wives were informed that their husbands were actually Jewish—and, perhaps even worse, government agents—and then the women were given a choice of being sent to an Arab country, to avoid any local retaliation, or being resettled with their husbands in Jewish communities in Israel.

Almost all chose to stay with their husbands, even in the very changed circumstances. Some of the wives needed and got psychological counseling.

So the idea that latter-day Israeli “*mista’arvim*” (also sometimes rendered as “*mista-aravim*”) may have been utilized in the 9-11 hijackings and the related intrigues surrounding the 9-11 tragedy has some very real foundation, no matter what the critics might otherwise contend.

In fact, serious questions have been raised about the identities of the Sept. 11 “Arab hijackers.”

While the media reported the ringleader’s passport conveniently landed atop rubble eight blocks from “Ground Zero,” *The Orlando Sentinel* also reported that at least four men identified as hijackers were not dead and had nothing to do with the attacks—that others unknown had stolen the identities of those individuals and used those identities during the 9-11 attacks.

And the fact remains that, to this day, there is really no firm evidence of precisely *who* the individuals were who were aboard (or purported to be aboard) the 9-11 airliners that day. We really don’t know if they were Arabs or even if they were the specific Arabs that they were said to be. Nor can it be discounted, as we’ve suggested, that at least some of them could have been Jewish assets of the Mossad, posing as Arabs.

But it gets even murkier. In *The New Yorker* on Oct. 8, 2001 Pulitzer Prize winner Seymour Hersh pointed out:

Many of the investigators believe that some of the initial clues about the terrorists’ identities and preparations, such as flight manuals, were meant to be found. A former high-level intelligence official told me, “Whatever trail was left was left deliberately—for the FBI to chase.”

Why Arabs would plant evidence implicating their own is an interesting point the mainstream media chose not to address.

Nor has the media ever identified to a grateful nation the unnamed citizen who tipped off the FBI where the hijackers' car (conveniently filled with "evidence") was parked, having had a chance encounter with the hijackers at an airport parking lot. That story—much-ballyhooed by the media on Sept. 11—was quickly dispatched to the Memory Hole.

Hersh also raised questions about whether or not bin Laden's network was capable of carrying out the terrorist attack alone. Hersh noted that a senior military officer had suggested to him that, in Hersh's words, "a major foreign intelligence service might also have been involved."

And while Hersh did not point any fingers anywhere, a reader familiar with Hersh's past history of pinpointing intrigue by Israel's Mossad could perhaps read between the lines and guess at which foreign nation Hersh's source might, however obliquely, be alluding.

And for those who doubted that Israel would endanger American Jews via terrorism, consider this: hard-line Israelis are willing to kill Jews if it means assuring Israel's survival.

The late Rabbi Meir Kahane—founder of the the Jewish Defense League, and a spiritual mentor of hard-line fundamentalists in Israel—exemplified those willing to sacrifice other Jews to guarantee Israel's future. Kahane called for killing "Hellenist [i.e. Western-oriented] spiritually sick [Jews] who threaten the existence of Judaism." And needless to say, that would include those Jews working in slick offices in the World Trade Center, living on Long Island, rather than kibbutzing in Israel.

Israeli journalist Yair Kotler reported in his book, *Heil Kahane*, that Kahane wrote that "the adoption of foreign, gentitized [i.e. non-Jewish] concepts by a Jewish state . . . opens the door to a national tragedy."

In his own book, *Time to Go Home*, Kahane called for all Jews to "go home" to Israel—the only safe place for Jews. Those who refused to "go home" were not safe and expendable. The CIA's 1979 report on Israeli intelligence said this widely-held view mirrors "the aggressively ideological nature of Zionism."

In fact, this Jewish attitude toward the West (exactly what the media says is the Islamic attitude) has support at the Mossad's top levels. In *The False Prophet*, his biography of Rabbi Kahane, the late Robert I. Friedman revealed that "high-ranking members of Mossad" were directing Kahane and that the "central player" was former Mossad operations chief (and later prime minister) Yitzhak Shamir, an often hateful critic of the United States America.

When Kahane said America would become "the major enemy of Israel," due to "economic disintegration which no administration can stem," he enunciated a popular Israeli view, one which is not widely known, particularly to American Christian supporters of Israel.

In his Kahane biography, Friedman noted that Kahane's views "have taken root and have become 'respectable,'" and that right-wing Israeli leader Ariel Sharon was one of the "most potent supporters" of such extremism. In the Oct. 15, 2001 issue of the stridently pro-Israel *New Republic*, Israeli writer Yossi Klein Halevi echoed this view:

The destruction of the World Trade Center has partially rehabilitated, if only by default, the Zionist promise of safe refuge for the Jewish people.

In the last year, it had become a much-noted irony that Israel was the country where a Jew was most likely to be killed for being a Jew.

For many, the United States had beckoned as the real Jewish refuge; in a poll taken just before the bin Laden attacks, 37 percent of Israelis said their friends or relatives were discussing emigration. That probably changed on Sept. 11.

I was among the thousands of Israelis who crowded Kennedy Airport on the weekend after the attack, desperate to find a flight to Tel Aviv. "At least we're going back where it's safe," people joked.

Everyone seemed to have a story about an Israeli living in New York who just barely escaped the devastation. If this could happen in Manhattan, the reasoning went, you might as well take your chances at home.

What Halevi described reflects the widespread ideology known as "catastrophic Zionism" which rejects America, saying Israel is the only safe Jewish refuge.

In *The Ascendance of Israel's Radical Right*, Israeli scholar Ehud Sprinzak asserted that these views are "a major school" of modern Israeli thought. Sprinzak described the Israeli movement, Sikarikin, which honors ancient Jews who "conducted a systematic terror campaign against Jewish moderates who were ready to come to terms with the Romans on questions of religious purity." Israelis consider these terrorists "the symbolic defenders of religious and nationalist purity."

Another popular rabbi, Israel Ariel, would risk massive loss of Jewish lives to achieve the "elimination" of the Arab countries to guarantee Israel's survival. The hawkish rabbi once proclaimed:

There is a ruling that a war is permitted as long as no more than one-sixth of the nation be killed. And this was stated in relation to an ordinary war, a fight between neighbors.

A war for Eretz Israel does not depend on the number of casualties. The command is "Ase!" ("Do it!"), and you may be sure that the number of casualties will thus be minimal.

As far as non-Jews, Sprinzak cited Rabbi David Bar-Haim who declared that the concept that Jews and non-Jews are equals "stands in total contrast to the Torah of Moses, and is derived from a total ignorance and an assimilation of alien Western values."

Ben-Haim cited ten religious authorities who "repeatedly proposed that Gentiles are more beast than human," whereas, "only two authorities recognize non-Jews as full human beings created in the image of God."

Bear in mind: these comments from supposed "allies" represent widespread opinion in Israel's military and intelligence services.

And should anyone still doubt the concept of right-wing Israeli "suicide bombers" (posing as Arabs) orchestrating the events of Sept. 11, consider Israel's own effective contingency plan for national suicide.

Most Americans have no idea that the possibility of a full-fledged nuclear "suicide bombing" by the state of Israel itself is a cornerstone of Israel's national security policy. This policy is better known by what the aforementioned Seymour Hersh referred to, in his book by the same name, as "the Samson Option."

As Hersh documented—and which Israeli historian Avner Cohen has confirmed in even more in-depth detail in his own book, *Israel and the Bomb*—Israel's entire national defense policy (from its inception) was framed around the development of a nuclear bomb. As Hersh made clear, the Israelis are essentially willing, if necessary, to "blow up the world"—including themselves—if they have to do so in order to defeat their Arab foes if they perceive that Israel's survival is actually in danger.

The so-called "Samson Option" for Israel is based on the story of Samson in the Bible who—after being captured by the Philistines—brought down Dagon's Temple in Gaza and killed himself along with his enemies. This is what Hersh notes Israeli nuclear planners considered "the Samson Option"—that, as Samson of the Bible, after being captured by the Philistines, brought down Dagon's Temple in Gaza and killed himself along with his enemies. As Hersh put it: "For Israel's nuclear advocates, the Samson Option became another way of saying 'Never again.'"

In his book *Open Secrets*—a study of Israel's strategic foreign policy—Israeli writer Israel Shahak wrote that, contrary to general perception, Israel does not seek peace. It is a myth, he said, that there is any real difference between the supposedly "conflicting" policies being pursued by the "opposing" Likud and Labor blocs whose rivalries, played out on the global stage, have overflowed into the American political process.

Shahak contended that the Israeli lobby in the United States—with all its often-seemingly diverse factions—is ultimately propping up Israel’s policy of expansionism with the final aim of consolidating “Eretz Israel”—an imperial state in control of practically the entire Middle East.

Based almost entirely on public pronouncements in the Hebrew language press in Israel, Shahak’s provocative volume points out that what the Israeli government tells its own people about its policies is entirely inconsistent with Israel’s insistence to the West and the world at large that Israel “wants peace.” In Shahak’s informed judgment:

One cannot understand Israel until one understands Israel is essentially a militarist state and an un-democratic one at that, evidenced by the second-class status accorded its Arab inhabitants and those Christian and Muslim Palestinians in occupied territories. The nation’s very foundation rests upon its military and defense policies, which, as Shahak makes clear, ultimately stem from the fanatic religious tendencies dictating the thinking of its military and intelligence leaders who are the prime movers behind the engine of state.

Although Israel is quite capable of forging temporary (and often covert) alliances and strategic arrangements even with Arab or Muslim states—even to the point of dealing with the hated Saddam Hussein when it was in Israel’s immediate interest and even, at one point, with the Islamic Republic of Iran—the bottom line is, quite simply, that—as Shahak demonstrates quite chillingly—Israel will say and do anything to pursue its determined goal of winning total domination at all costs. If it fails, Israel is perfectly willing to choose “the Samson Option.”

Thus, it seems, when Winston Churchill said that the Jews suffered from a strong impulse of self-destruction, he was not far off the mark.

So the idea that Israeli Jews under the discipline of Israeli intelligence may indeed have postured as Arabs on Sept. 11, leading the ill-fated 9-11 airliners to their destruction, is not quite so easily discounted.

Therefore, my report on the possibility that “*mista’arvim*” Jews, working for the Mossad, had actually been the “real” 9-11 hijackers—or, at the very least, manipulating genuine “bin Laden Muslims” in some aspect of the 9-11 conspiracy—had some very real and very solid historical and geopolitical foundation.

Despite this, even a lot of folks who suspected Israeli involvement in 9-11 seemed to avoid mentioning this possibility. It seems that many of them preferred more exotic, less simple, explanations.

The truth is that so many 9-11 truth seekers preferred to dabble in endless debates about forensic matters relating to 9-11 that are, in most respects, far beyond the understanding of the average person and which thus have very little impact in awakening Americans to 9-11 truth.

And, in fact, one can find genuine “experts” who take completely opposite positions on these issues, with both (or, as the case may be, multiple) contrary arguments all seeming to put forth logical and scientifically-based explanations for the “truth” they have uncovered.

The bottom-line consequence of all of this is that 9-11 truthers find themselves in a bind, arguing among themselves over such matters as “what actually brought down the trade towers” and getting distracted from the real question at hand: WHO did it?

In fact, my speculation relating to the possibility that Israeli Jews were posing as “Arabs” on 9-11—first published in *American Free Press*, on Dec. 24, 2001—was actually picked up and—on Dec. 31, 2001—republished in its entirety by *Arab News*, an influential English-language newspaper of the Saudi Arabian government. And the story was subsequently picked up by Arab-language newspapers elsewhere.

That the the publication of my article by the Saudi government-sponsored journal set in motion a little-publicized (but politically significant) international controversy is, in itself (I think) quite telling indeed.

After *Arab News* published the article, the U.S. government made an official demand that the Saudis repudiate any suggestion the hijackers were anything other than Arabs. My article apparently hit too close to the mark (and to this day, I think it may very well have been a bulls-eye).

But while many American critics would, naturally, say it was no surprise that an Arab media voice might take heart in the thesis that Israeli agents (posing as Arabs) might put themselves forward as suicide bombers, the thought of a Jewish Israeli suicide bomber is not something considered beyond the pale by the average Israeli.

In fact, the concept of a devoutly-religious Israeli suicide bomber was the talk of Israel for several years in the wake of the release of a blockbuster Israeli-made motion picture, *Time of Favor*. The Hebrew-language film was not only a major hit, but it also captured six prizes in the Israeli Academy Awards, including best picture, best screenplay, best actor and best actress—quite an accomplishment indeed.

What is interesting is that *Time of Favor* was scheduled for release in New York theaters in September of 2001, but in the wake of the Sept. 11 “suicide bombing” tragedy that rocked the Big Apple and the world, the premiere was shelved. And according to the New York-based *Forward*, the respected Jewish newspaper, the film had even been played on flights of Israel’s El Al airlines.

The drama told the story of a brilliant Orthodox rabbinical student who—when rebuffed in romance—launched a plan to stage a suicide bombing under Israel’s Temple Mount, the site which has been a long-standing point of contention between Israel and the Muslim world.

Forward noted, intriguingly, that “central to the drama” is a character, an Orthodox rabbi, “for whom the Orthodox Zionist soldiers are disciples as well as students.”

The balance of the film told of the effort to stop the fanatic from carrying out his scheme which, if successful, could have sparked a major war, ushering in the Armageddon that Christian fundamentalists pray for.

Joseph Cedar, the film’s director, admitted to *Forward* that American audiences might find the film unsettling. “It’s about putting the Jews on the terrorist side, which is a reality, but it’s not a thing that American Jews, for example, are used to hearing. It’s about suspecting Jews of belonging to a terrorist group.”

What *Forward* did not mention was that most Americans—including those who lost friends and family in the 9-11 attacks—will probably never see the film which played largely in small “art” houses and in theaters catering to “Jewish-interest” audiences. And therefore, of course, they will never realize that Jewish boys can be suicide bombers, too.

Nor likewise will most Americans probably ever know one of the biggest secrets of the 20th Century—one carefully buried by the most influential media voices of our times: The fact that on Oct. 18, 1983 a Jewish Israeli suicide bomber, strapped with explosives, was captured in the spectators’ gallery of the U.S. House of Representatives in the U.S. Capitol in Washington. When it happened, it barely made the news.

Until I personally first unveiled this story to a national audience in the September 30, 2002 issue of *American Free Press*, anyone using the popular “Google” search engine on the Internet would have not found even a single mention of this little-known event.

Since that time, however, word of the story has begun to spread, thanks to people who read my report in *American Free Press* (or a later reference to it in my book, *The Confessions of an Anti-Semite*) and who subsequently distributed the information via the Internet.

However, despite the fact that Americans know all about “Muslim suicide bombers”—particularly in the wake of the 9-11 tragedy—the little-known story of an Israeli suicide bomber inside the United States Capitol building remains largely unknown.

Even *The Washington Post*—the newspaper of record in the nation’s capital—buried the story in its Oct. 19, 1983 “Metro” section on page C13—across from the obituaries and next to a story about local political candidates in Fairfax County, Virginia. Evidently an attempt to bomb the U.S. Capitol—by an Israeli, anyway—wasn’t front page news.

The *Post* story about the Israeli attempt to bomb the Capitol was headlined “Man Arrested in U.S. Capitol After Alleged Bomb Threat”—note that it was “only” an “alleged” threat—and reported as follows:

A 22-year-old man was arrested in the public gallery of the House of Representatives during a roll-call vote yesterday after he allegedly threatened to blow up the building, U.S. Capitol police said.

The man, whom police said carried an Israeli passport indicating he had arrived in this country two weeks ago, was removed from the gallery without incident and taken downstairs to be questioned.

There, police said, they found the man had two soft-drink bottles filled with a powdered substance attached to his belt and wired to an apparently operative detonating cap.

Police said they charged Israel Rubinowits with threatening to kidnap a person or cause bodily harm in the incident, pending arraignment today in D.C. Superior Court.

The incident occurred about 1:30 pm as House members were in the chamber voting on a measure that would allow the U.S. Treasury to strike and sell a medal commemorating Vietnam veterans. The measure passed 410-0.

The man was sitting in House Gallery 10, an area of about 75 seats located in the far left corner of the chamber from the speaker's platform, among a public tour group of about 50 persons when detectives noticed he was acting suspiciously and mumbling to himself, officials said. As the officers approached the man, officials said, he allegedly threatened to blow up the building.

Officials said the bottles and suspected detonator were turned over to demolition experts for examination, but it was unclear late last night whether they could have caused an explosion.

Rubinowits was being held last night in the central cell block at police headquarters. Officials said they [had] no additional information about his background.

On Nov. 2—nearly two weeks after the attempted suicide bombing—America's most prestigious newspaper, *The New York Times*, finally deemed it appropriate to report on the story—buried on page A-22, hardly the front page of the distinguished daily.

And weirdly (or perhaps not so weirdly) a check of *The New York Times* online will find that the story (as indexed by the *Times*) is titled "Bomb Carrier Found in U.S. Home Prompts Tightened Security." So according to the headline in the *Times*, the story was about a bomb found in a "home"—not the U.S. House of Representatives!

But the story did, in fact, tell of the Israeli suicide bomber in the House, raising the question as to why the word “home”—rather than the word “House”—somehow managed to be used “mistakenly” in a newspaper not generally perceived to be rife with typographical atrocities.

Wayne Todd, editor of the National Legislative Service & Security Association, noted in the Nov. 1983 issue of his newsletter that the story of the Israeli suicide bomber’s attempt to detonate his weapon of terrorism inside the Capitol was “virtually ignored by the media.”

In any event, on Nov. 9—less than a month afterward—a bomb did explode near the Senate Chamber inside the U.S. Capitol, blowing the doors off a room leading to the offices of then-Senate Minority Leader Robert Byrd (D-W.Va.). The explosion took place just seven to nine minutes after a caller phoned Byrd’s office and warned a bomb was about to explode. Media reports said a group calling itself the “Armed Resistance Unit” claimed credit, saying its motive was to protest the U.S. invasion of Grenada and the presence of U.S. Marines in Lebanon.

Why Byrd—not known as a major advocate of U.S. intervention abroad—was the target was never explained. However, considering the fact Byrd was one of the few members of Congress in recent times to challenge Israel’s “war lobby” in Washington, there is always the possibility the bombing (apparently aimed at Byrd) was an Israeli “false flag” to shift the focus of blame elsewhere and hide Israel’s culpability.

In 1998 even the Legislative Resource Center (LRC) of the House of Representatives had “no further information” on what happened to the would-be Israeli suicide bomber after he was charged with, in the LRC’s words, “making threats.” However, *The Titusville* (Pennsylvania) *Herald*, reported on Jan. 9, 1986—long after the 1983 incident—that Rubinowits had been deported to Israel, much like the Dancing Israelis of 9-11. But even the *Herald* contained the report about the Israeli bomber amidst a longer story focusing on Arab terrorism!

Although I am not prepared to suggest that the young Israeli captured in the U.S. Capitol was acting as an asset of Israel when he engaged in his failed suicide mission—obviously I have no proof that he was—the possibility should not be ruled out.

However, these are the points that need to be emphasized: 1) There is a long-standing “suicide tradition” in Jewish history; 2) Modern-day Jewish zealots have talked about suicide missions; 3) There is evidence of Israeli utilization of Jews, posing as Arabs, in covert missions; and 4) Israel—as a state—is ideologically prepared to sacrifice other Jews to achieve the ultimate end of securing Israel’s survival.

Understanding these critical points is central to understanding Israel’s ultimate role in orchestrating the 9-11 terrorist tragedy.

CHAPTER TWENTY-FOUR

Israel's Covert Manipulation of Muslim Extremists: Toward Understanding Israel's Secret Role in the 9-11 Terrorist Tragedy

In the preceding chapter we pondered the possibility that at least some of the primary alleged players on 9-11—the reputed Arab hijackers—were actually Israeli Jews, so-called “*mis-ta'arvim*” posing as Arabs, that these Israelis literally sacrificed themselves in a suicide mission designed to help set the stage for the vaunted “Clash of Civilizations” that was a foundation for the “War on Terror” that was launched in the wake of 9-11.

However, even if—per chance—this thesis might be mistaken in part (or in whole), the fact remains that Israel has a long and ugly history of providing covert support (and financing) for Islamic fundamentalist extremists and this fact alone cannot, under any circumstances, be dismissed in considering the likelihood that Israel was indeed the prime mover behind the 9-11 terrorist attacks.

Why in the world, some more naive folks would ask, would Israel—so long under siege from Islamic fundamentalists—provide covert support for the very extremists who seek to destroy that little bastion of democratic principles and Western interests in the Middle East

What interests could the Israelis and the likes of Osama bin Laden and his followers ever have in common?

The answer to those provocative questions point toward a dirty little secret that the major media in America has long kept under wraps.

As hard as it may be for the average American to digest, there is a solid record of evidence pointing toward a long-time—albeit little-known—role by Israel's Mossad in providing financing and tactical support for the very “Muslim extremists” presumed to be Israel's worst enemies. The truth is that Muslim extremists have proven useful (if often unwitting) tools in advancing Israel's own geopolitical agenda.

Although the media has devoted much coverage to the topic of “Islamic fundamentalism,” the media has failed to pursue the documented behind-the-scenes linkage between Israel and the terrorist networks now the focus of media obsession.

In fact, evidence suggests that the world's number one Muslim villain—Osama bin Laden—was certainly working with the Mossad in years past even if, by the time of the 9-11 terrorist attacks, he was (by that point) operating as an independent “wild card,” so to speak.

Although many Americans are now aware that bin Laden's early efforts against the Soviets in Afghanistan were sponsored by the CIA, the media has been reticent to point out that this arms pipeline—described

by *Covert Action Information Bulletin* (September 1987) as “the second largest covert operation” in the CIA’s history—was also, according to former Mossad operative Victor Ostrovsky (writing in *The Other Side of Deception*), under the direct supervision of the Mossad.

Ostrovsky noted that: “It was a complex pipeline since a large portion of the Mujahideen’s weapons were American-made and were supplied to the Muslim Brotherhood directly from Israel, using as carriers the Bedouin nomads who roamed the demilitarized zones in the Sinai.”

Former ABC News correspondent John K. Cooley, in *Unholy Wars: Afghanistan, America and International Terrorism*, provided confirmation for Ostrovsky’s allegations. He wrote:

Discussion of the input of outsiders to training and operations in Afghanistan would be incomplete without mention of Iran and the State of Israel. Iran’s major role in training and in supply is a matter of historical record. As for Israel, the evidence is much sketchier.

At least half a dozen knowledgeable individuals insisted to the author, without citing proof, that Israel was indeed involved in both training and supply

Whether or not units of Israel’s elite special forces trained the Muslim warriors, who would soon turn their guns against Israel in Muslim organizations like Hamas, is a well-guarded Israeli secret.

Several Americans and Britons who took part in the training program have assured the author that Israelis did indeed take part, though no one will own to having actually seen, or spoken with, Israeli instructors or intelligence operatives in Afghanistan or Pakistan.

What is certain is that of all the members of the anti-Soviet coalition, the Israelis have been the most successful in concealing the details and even the broad traces of a training role; much more than the Americans and British

In addition, Sami Masri, a former insider in the infamous Bank of Credit and Commerce International (BCCI) told Jonathan Beaty and S. C. Gwynne (both of *Time* magazine) that BCCI “was financing Israeli arms going into Afghanistan. There were Israeli arms, Israeli planes, and CIA pilots. Arms were coming into Afghanistan and [BCCI was] facilitating.”

In fact, obviously, although BCCI was generally said to be an “Arab” or “Muslim” bank, BCCI was very much working in close concert with the Mossad in the very realm where bin Laden first made his mark.

So there is evidence, indeed, that bin Laden was very much part of a network closely tied to Mossad intrigue in the arming and training of the Afghan rebels.

However, there's much more to the story of the Mossad's ties to the so-called Islamic terror networks that are the stuff of American nightmares today.

In his follow-up book, *The Other Side of Deception*, ex-Mossad figure Victor Ostrovsky unveiled the disturbing fact that the Mossad had a long history of supporting radical Islamic groups for its own purposes.

Pointing out that Arab- and Muslim-hating hard-liners in Israel's Mossad believe Israel's survival lies in its military strength and that "this strength arises from the need to answer the constant threat of war," the Israeli hard-liners fear that any peace with any Arab state could weaken Israel and bring about its demise. In that vein, Ostrovsky wrote:

Supporting the radical elements of Muslim fundamentalism sat well with the Mossad's general plan for the region. An Arab world run by fundamentalists would not be a party to any negotiations with the West, thus leaving Israel again as the only democratic, rational country in the region.

One of Israel's prime targets was the kingdom of Jordan, then-ruled by King Hussein who was actually in the process of making peace overtures toward Israel. Ostrovsky reported that the Mossad was determined to "destabilize Jordan to the point of civil anarchy." The means used were to be:

A high influx of counterfeit currency, causing distrust in the market; arming religious fundamentalist elements similar to the Hamas and the Muslim Brotherhood; and assassinating leading figures who are symbols of stability, causing riots in the universities and forcing the government to respond with harsh measures and lose popularity.

Actually, this tactic has also been used by the Mossad in dealing with non-Arab nations. For example, in the March 1982 edition of his newsletter, *Middle East Perspective*, Dr. Alfred Lilienthal, a pioneer American Jewish critic of Israel, reported that Italy's then-top-ranking magistrate, Ferdinando Imposimato, had charged, in Imposimato's words:

At least until 1978, the Israeli secret service infiltrated Italian subversive organizations and on more than one occasion

gave arms, money and information to the [terrorist] Red Brigades. The Israeli plan was to reduce Italy to a country torn by civil war so that the United States would have to depend more on Israeli for security in the Mediterranean.

Lilienthal noted that Imposimato's sources were two jailed Red Brigades leaders who reported the Israelis not only helped the Red Brigades enroll new recruits but also track down traitors who fled abroad.

Even columnist Jack Anderson, a devoted propaganda conduit for the Israeli lobby, has bragged of Israel's skill in such realms. As long ago as September 17, 1972 Anderson wrote that:

The Israelis are also skillful at exploiting Arab rivalries and turning Arab against Arab. The Kurdish tribes, for example, inhabit the mountains of northern Iraq. Every month, a secret Israeli envoy slips into the mountains from the Iranian side to deliver \$50,000 to Kurdish leader Mulla Mustafa al Barzani. The subsidy insures Kurdish hostility against Iraq, whose government is militantly anti-Israel.

In an April 25, 1983 column, Anderson pointed out that one secret State Department report speculated that if Palestine Liberation Organization leader Yassir Arafat were to be dislodged, "the Palestinian movement will probably disintegrate into radical splinter groups, which, in combination with other revolutionary forces in the region, would pose a grave threat to the moderate Arab governments."

Then, according to Anderson's account, the State Department reported that:

Israel seems determined to vent this threat . . . and can be expected to greatly expand its covert cooperations with revolutionary movements.

Anderson added that "two well-placed intelligence sources" had explained that this meant that it was in Israel's interests to "divide and conquer" by setting various Palestinian factions against one another. This would then help destabilize all of the Arab and Islamic regimes in the Middle East. Anderson then stated flat out that the sources said that "Israel had secretly provided funds to Abu Nidal's group."

Anderson's reports about Abu Nidal's apparent ties to the Mossad were only the tip of the iceberg. British journalist Patrick Seale, an

acknowledged authority on the Middle East, devoted an entire book, entitled *Abu Nidal: A Gun for Hire*, outlining and documenting his thesis that Nidal was largely a surrogate for the Mossad all along.

In the wake of 9-11, Nidal (then reportedly in retirement) had been replaced by Osama bin Laden in media headlines as “the world’s most wanted terrorist.” (But Nidal himself died in 2002 in Baghdad, allegedly killed at the orders of Saddam Hussein.)

In any case, like Nidal’s efforts to divide the Arab world, particularly the Palestinian cause, bin Laden’s activities seem to have a congruence of interests with those of Israel, although this is something that the major media has not been ready to acknowledge.

While bin Laden himself (quite notably) had never been known to have attacked an Israeli or Jewish target, even *The Washington Post* noted that bin Laden’s primary goal was bolstering “a destabilizing grand of Islamic fundamentalism in a long list of existing Middle East and Central Asia regimes.”

That same *Post* article revealed that—contrary to the general public view that somehow bin Laden was in league with favorite Israeli targets such as Iraq’s Saddam Hussein and Libya’s Muammar Qaddafi, a former bin Laden associate had testified that bin Laden was, in fact, quite hostile to both the Iraqi leader and the Libyan leader. This again quite in line with Israel’s attitude toward the two Arab icons.

So considering bin Laden’s previous ties to the joint CIA-Mossad operations in Afghanistan coupled with his unusual congruence of agenda with the Mossad, the question naturally arises as to whether bin Laden was a successor to presumed Mossad surrogate Abu Nidal in more ways than one.

Thus, at the very least, if bin Laden was not acting as a Mossad asset on 9-11 (and for the record, *I do not believe that he was*), the fact remains that bin Laden nonetheless was fully in place and served as an ideal “false flag” when the Mossad needed the “perfect villain” to serve as the fall guy, the patsy, when the 9-11 conspiracy came to fruition.

In the end, the idea of the CIA and the Mossad financing Islamic terrorist groups is not extraordinary to more savvy folks.

As long ago as March 15, 1982, writing in *The Spotlight*, Andrew St. George revealed that the big secret about the scandal involving former top CIA official Edwin Wilson’s international arms smuggling was Wilson’s partnership with the Mossad. While Wilson contended that these activities were done with the approval of the CIA—which denied it, of course—the major media kept Wilson’s Mossad link under wraps.

St. George reported that Wilson had teamed with with two veteran Mossad agents, Hans Ziegler and David Langham, who set up a firm,

Zimex, Ltd., based in Switzerland. The project was known by its CIA cryptonym, Klapex, and was nothing more than joint undercover CIA-Mossad operation to set up a chain of dummy business firms for the purpose of selling and chartering personal jet aircraft to Arab leaders that would then be used for Israeli intelligence purposes.

Ranging from corporate jets to giant 707s, the planes came with flight and maintenance crews, each of which numbered Mossad operatives among its members. The primary mission of the Israeli spies was to operate and service the electronic eavesdropping systems concealed in the cabin of each plane to record the confidential conversations of Arab statesmen in midflight. However, the commercial network under Klapex was used for an even more sinister purpose:

To provide covert aid to some nationalistic, pan-Arab and Islamic radical movements in Sudan, Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia and the other Persian Gulf states. In each case, when the Mossad extended such secret assistance—whether in cash or access to smuggled weapons, or in some other form—the purpose was to weaken or pressure some government thought hostile or dangerous to Israel at that particular moment.

While I had unveiled many of these little-known details in the pages of *American Free Press* in some detail immediately after 9-11—with the predictable response that I was accused of promulgating “anti-Semitic conspiracy theories,” the establishment news source, UPI, finally confirmed in a June 28, 2002 dispatch what I had reported some eight months previously: the fact that Israel did have a strange history of covert financing and support for Islamic fundamentalist groups, a point that most Americans would find absolutely inconceivable.

Veteran UPI correspondent Richard Sale confirmed the substance of AFP's initial report, citing not only a variety of named and un-named past and present U.S. government officials but also documents obtained by UPI from the Israel-based Institute for Counter-Terrorism.

Noting that Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon was vowing to fight “Palestinian terror,” declaring Hamas as “the deadliest terrorist group that we have ever had to face,” Sale noted wryly that “Sharon left something out.” That “something,” according to Sale, was that while Israel and Hamas were then locked in deadly combat, “according to several current and former U.S. intelligence officials, beginning in the late 1970s, Tel Aviv gave direct and indirect financial aid to Hamas over a period of years.”

Sale's expose demonstrated conclusively that while Israel was now calling for the United States to lend its military might to help Israel

crush the burgeoning Hamas movement among disgusted Palestinians in the occupied West Bank and the Gaza Strip, it turns out that it was Israel itself that helped nurture Hamas in the first place.

In short, Israel was ultimately to blame for the very “Islamic terrorism” and the wave of suicide bombings then rocking Israel.

Sale pointed out that Hamas was actually legally registered as an Islamic social and religious entity in Israel in 1978 and that U.S. administration officials said that funding for Hamas came from not just the oil-producing Arab states but “directly and indirectly from Israel.”

While the PLO itself was secular, promoting Palestinian nationalism, Hamas was intent upon setting up a transnational state ruled by the tenets of Islam.

Cited an unnamed former senior CIA official saying Israel’s support for Hamas “was a direct attempt to divide and dilute support for a strong, secular [Palestine Liberation Organization] by using a competing religious alternative,” Sale also quoted Tony Cordesman, a respected veteran Middle East analyst associated with the Center for Strategic Studies, who said Israel “aided Hamas directly—the Israelis wanted to use it as a counterbalance to the PLO.”

Then, when the PLO moved its base of operations to Beirut, Hamas began growing in influence in the Israeli-occupied West Bank. The movement also received strong support generated by the rise of the Iranian-backed Hezbollah movement in Lebanon.

All of these elements converged at precisely the time when Israeli was funding Hamas. However, even the growing strength and independence of Hamas did not deter the Israelis from supporting Hamas.

Quite the contrary.

A U.S. government official—who asked not to be named—told Sale that “The thinking on the part of some of the right-wing Israeli establishment was that Hamas and the others, if they gained control, would refuse to have any part of the peace process and would torpedo any agreements put in place. Israel would still be the only democracy in the region for the United States to deal with.”

In other words, Israel was propping up Hamas to undermine Yasser Arafat and the PLO and thereby disrupting the very real peace initiatives being made by Arafat. In short, Israel wanted an unending state of war in order to be able to continue to justify its occupation of the West Bank and Gaza and—inevitably—expand Israel’s borders into what is known as “Greater Israel,” a geopolitical entity reaching from “the Nile to the Euphrates,” encompassing much of the Arab Middle East.

(This maneuvering by Israel—the stoking of chaos in the Middle East for greater purposes, including the destabilization of its Arab neigh-

bors, and, at the same time, effectively building Israel from within, by enforcing a “siege” mentality in the face of presumed threats from others—is part of a little-known Israeli geopolitical philosophy known as “war Zionism” or “catastrophic Zionism.”

)In fact, this strategy has, in many respects, made Israel what it is today: a nation where its inter-related military and “homeland security” industries are booming and Israel arms and security technology exports are expanding exponentially worldwide, with Israeli firms and their subsidiaries virtually monopolizing the “homeland security” market even within the United States itself—and much of this as a direct consequence of the 9-11 terrorist tragedy and the enshrouding of the concept of “homeland security” on American soil.)

So it was that with the sponsorship of Hamas that the Israelis had set in motion—as they soon discovered—a movement that quickly grew out of control. And although the Israelis sought to manipulate Hamas from within—penetrating it with Israeli spies—independent-minded Hamas leaders weeded out Israeli collaborators. Hamas thus became a self-sustaining, popularly-backed movement that emerged as a very real threat to Israel, to the extent that any such movement could be a threat to the well-armed and U.S.-backed Zionist state.

UPI's Richard Sale pointed out that Israel's posturing and manipulation “disgusts” U.S. analysts who have watched Israel's initial nurturing of the very groups that Israel now demands that the United States and the world wage war against on Israel's behalf.

Belying Israel's media-vaunted skill at “fighting terrorism,” former State Department counter-terrorism official Larry Johnson told Sale: “The Israelis are their own worst enemies when it comes to fighting terrorism. The Israelis are like a guy who sets fire to his hair and then tries to put it out by hitting it with a hammer. They do more to incite and sustain terrorism than curb it.”

Those who view the Middle East conflict in a childish “Good Israelis vs. Evil Arab Terrorists” perspective will be unable to understand the facts that *The Spotlight*, then *American Free Press* and now UPI (via Richard Sale) had unraveled. However, those who dare to look at the realities of geopolitics will get a shocking perspective on how Israel has manipulated Middle East events.

And in the bigger picture, it may help bring us to a closer understanding of how the Israelis certainly utilized at least some genuine (unknowing) Islamic fundamentalists in carrying off the first great crime of the 20th Century: the 9-11 tragedy. This was indeed a critical part of the false flag template for terror that made Israel's monstrous attack on America possible.

CHAPTER TWENTY-FIVE:

Israel's Agents Inside Al-Qaeda: A Critical Element of the Mossad's Template for Terror in the 9-11 Conspiracy

After seven months of non-stop declarations by U.S. government spokesmen in the wake of 9-11 that there existed solid proof tying 19 Muslim men to plotting the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, FBI Director Robert Mueller actually admitted quite the opposite in a speech that he delivered to the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco on April 19, 2002.

In its May 20, 2002 issue, *American Free Press* reported this remarkable revelation which was based on a largely little-noticed report, originating with *The Los Angeles Times*, that was reprinted in *The Washington Post* on April 30.

In his speech in San Francisco, Mueller said that the purported hijackers, in his words, “left no paper trail.” The FBI director stated flatly:

In our investigation, we have not uncovered a single piece of paper—either here in the United States or in the treasure trove of information that has turned up in Afghanistan and elsewhere—that mentioned any aspect of the Sept. 11 plot.

In describing Mueller's evidence fiasco, *Los Angeles Times* reporters Erich Lichtblau and Josh Meyer, noted that:

Law enforcement officials say that while they have been able to reconstruct the movements of the hijackers before the attacks—all legal except for a few speeding tickets—they have found no evidence of their actual plotting.

The *Times* reporters acknowledged that Mueller's comments “offer the FBI's most comprehensive and detailed assessment to date of its investigation, remarkable as much for what investigators have not found as for what they have.”

The FBI director explained away the absence of evidence by making the disingenuous assertion that the hijackers used “meticulous planning, extraordinary secrecy and extensive knowledge of how America works” to conceal their scheme.

Mueller made this claim despite the fact that in the immediate wake of the Sept. 11 attacks, a variety of U.S. officials and media sources announced, almost instantaneously, that there was firm evidence not

only that these 19 Muslim men were agents of Osama bin Laden's Al-Qaeda "network" but that they were indeed the individuals who hijacked the doomed flights on Sept. 11.

Mueller seemed to forget that early government and media reports loudly hyped "discoveries"—letters and other documents—in the luggage and personal belongings of the presumed hijackers which "proved" that they were on a "mission for Allah," etc etc. Now Mueller's comments contradicted everything that had been said, everything that most Americans now assumed was "a fact."

Government spokesmen defended the cited lack of evidence as somehow proving how professional the hijackers were, even in the face of the publicly-acknowledged scandal surrounding the fact that two of the hijackers purportedly got into the United States even though they were on a CIA terrorist "watch list."

Skeptics rightly asked: If the 19 Muslims weren't the hijackers, then who were? That 19 Muslim men who had apparently disappeared were named as the hijackers was not in doubt. What was in doubt is whether those 19 men were actually plotting anything, either individually or together. The amazing possibility remained that others carried out the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, using the identities of the 19 Muslims who were assigned guilt in the tragedy.

In fact, there was the possibility that someone was pretending, prior to Sept. 11, to be Muhammad Atta. This would recall the strange appearances of multiple "Lee Harvey Oswalds" in various places doing suspicious things prior to the JFK assassination.

For example, although *The Washington Post* reported on May 1, 2002 that longstanding claims that Atta met in Prague with a purported Iraqi intelligence officer turned out not to be true, some sort of meeting did take place, except that, according to the *Post*, "they were no longer certain that Atta was the person" in question. The *Post* cited a Bush administration official as saying that the person believed to be Atta "may be different from Atta." So, although there was someone later identified as Atta in Prague, according to the *Post*, "there was no evidence Atta left or returned to the U.S." at the time he was supposedly in Prague.

So it was that when the official 9-11 report, issued by the much-touted "blue ribbon" commission charged with the responsibility of telling the American people how and why the 9-11 attacks were able to happen, finally hit the presses—emerging as a veritable "best seller"—the truth is that it proved to be mostly a lot of fiction, based on lies and prevarications by some pretty suspect characters (as we shall see).

And that's not to mention the additional "spin" added by a host of "bipartisan" ghost writers, representing a bevy of special interest groups

that had a keen desire to have the story of “what really happened” on 9-11 told the way they want it. (Earlier, in Chapter Twenty-One we examined how the Israeli lobby pushed a potential roadblock to its agenda out of a key post in the congressional inquiry into 9-11.)

Although Americans beat a path to bookstores to grab up copies of the 9-11 report, what few realized is that even top-notch U.S. intelligence investigators and others had raised questions—from the beginning—about how reliable the report’s primary sources really were.

For example, although the report was written in an almost grandiloquent and certainly omniscient tone, the fact is that the panoramic overview of Osama bin Laden’s vaunted Al-Qaeda “network” was based largely on accounts provided by just two sources: Khalid Shaikh Mohammed and Ramzi bin al-Shibh.

While both were said to be key leaders in the 9-11 plot—with Mohammed often described as Al-Qaeda’s “operations chief”—or variations thereof—that’s about all that can be firmly said about either individual and the stories that they’ve told.

The truth is that—as even *The New York Times* pointed out in a quite circumspect yet still revealing story on June 17 2004: “Their accounts have stirred an unresolved debate about their credibility,” and “much of the information cited in the reports as fact is actually uncorroborated or nearly impossible to confirm.”

So even though the *Times* itself and every other major newspaper and magazine in America—not to mention hundreds of small town dailies—earnestly reprinted excerpts from the 9-11 report, along with extensive stories rehashing what appeared in the report, the *Times’* candid characterizations went largely unnoticed.

In fact, as far as *American Free Press* could determine at that time, AFP was the only publication thus far to have referenced these remarkable revelations, with the exception of several Internet sources that republished the original *Times* story.

The truth is that there were multiple concerns regarding the reliability of the sources. First of all, the *Times* noted, questions have been raised as to whether Mohammed or al-Shibh was tortured or threatened with torture prior to or during their questioning.

But that actually proves to be only a minor consideration in the minds of many upper echelon intelligence analysts who have doubts about the 9-11 report. The *Times* pointed out:

Not all counterterrorism officials believe, for example, that Osama bin Laden exercised the kind of command over the Sept. 11 operation that is described in the report.

... In part, the officials said, they suspect that the captured Qaeda figures have a strong desire to play down their own roles and have been willing to make it appear that Mr. bin Laden was the dominant figure in an effort to enhance his stature.

Investigators conducted a vast analysis of communications, including cellphone, Internet and courier traffic between the Sept. 11 plotters and their confederates, like Mr. Mohammed, the officials said.

That analysis failed to show a close link between them in the months before the attacks and virtually no communication with Mr. bin Laden, a finding that contradicts [the 9-11 report].

And the truth is that, despite all of the media hoopla about bin Laden's wide-ranging Al-Qaeda network, as far back as Nov. 5, 2001 *The Washington Post* itself reported that European investigators believed that the group alleged to have carried off the Sept. 11 attacks was "tightly insulated" and "had little if any contact with other Al-Qaeda terror cells in Europe." According to the *Post*, investigators found that hijackers were "elite, insulated," and that the question remained, according to one French terrorism expert, Roland Jacquard, as to who was in control: "Who gives the order?" asked Jacquard.

Suggesting that Muhammad Atta was the ringleader, Jacquard said Atta "probably" gave the order. However, Jacquard noted, "But Atta also received instructions. And there is someone between Atta and the mountain" [in Afghanistan where bin Laden was said to have made his lair]." The *Post* didn't make the suggestion that perhaps this "elite, insulated" group—which didn't seem to have any contact with the rest of the Al-Qaeda network—may have been under the actual and direct control of agents of Israel's Mossad.

These kinds of details raised serious questions about the reliability of the official 9-11 report in and of itself.

In fact, after the capture of Khalid Shaikh Mohammed—who became the primary "source" for the 9-11 commission report—the major media was rife with continuing scare stories surrounding "new revelations" about a variety of "terrorist plots." The primary source of these stories ostensibly came from official U.S. interrogations of Mohammed.

At one point, Mohammed is reported to have claimed the Sears Tower in Chicago and the Library Tower in Los Angeles were also targets but the attacks on those structures—allegedly planned as an immediate follow-up to the terrorism of 9-11—were sidetracked because of George W. Bush's thorough and immediate response to the 9-11 attacks.

While some might suggest that this kind of story actually plays into the Bush administration's bid to portray itself as a forceful leader in the "war against terrorism," Mohammed's claim also has the perhaps unintended effect of providing fuel to the fire of belief that Israeli operatives were indeed involved in—or had foreknowledge of—the 9-11 attacks and of the impending attack on the Sears Tower.

Although the story was brushed under the rug in the wake of the 9-11 tragedies, *American Free Press* readers will recall that as early as Dec. 24, 2001 AFP reported that:

On Oct. 17, the Pulitzer Prize-winning *Pottstown* (Pennsylvania) *Mercury* published a story noting that "two men whom police described as Middle Eastern" were detained in in the Pottstown area (which is just northwest of Philadelphia) after being found with "detailed video footage of the Sears Tower in Chicago"—the tallest building in the world, widely mentioned as a possible terrorist target.

The *Mercury* did not identify the men's nationality, but their names were Moshe Elmakias and Ron Katar. "Moshe" is a Hebrew name which is not likely to have been bestowed on a Muslim or an Arab. A woman named Ayelet Reisler, in their company, was also detained. She had a German passport in her name and medication in a different name.

The two men worked for a company known as "Moving Systems Incorporated." And, as we've seen, Israeli-connected moving companies seemed to proliferate in the events surround the 9-11 tragedies, although most of the published accounts of the strange activities of the Israeli-owned moving companies focused on events surrounding the FBI's seizure of what appears to be several groups of Israeli operatives in the New York-New Jersey area, one of which just happened to be videotaping the WTC towers as they collapsed.

Supporters of Israel protested that it was "just a coincidence" that several different suspiciously-acting groups of Israelis would be working for moving companies and have detailed videos of the WTC disaster and the Sears Tower, another potential terrorist target.

However, now that the purported Al-Qaeda chief of operations, Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, had claimed that the Sears Tower was supposedly one of Al-Qaeda's targets, the bizarre incident involving Israeli "moving company" workers in Pennsylvania with tapes of the Sears Tower in Chicago had new meaning.

The evidence, taken together, does indeed suggest that Israeli intelligence did indeed have "hands on" knowledge—at the very least—of the intentions of the terrorists who struck on American soil.

Although most "independent" 9-11 researchers fell back on the theory that Khalid Shaikh Mohammed's claims about 9-11 were the conse-

quence of having been tortured and made to say what he was reported to have said or, as some have contended, that the Mohammed in custody wasn't, in fact, "the real" Mohammed, these theories very much pale behind the little-noticed and much bigger picture that so many 9-11 conspiracy theorists—the 9-11 "truthers"—have missed (or otherwise deliberately ignored).

The fact is that an assembly of very real evidence suggests that Mohammed was a longtime covert Israeli intelligence asset operating inside Al-Qaeda and Islamic fundamentalist circles and that the stories he provided (ostensibly "under torture") to the 9-11 commission were carefully-crafted "black propaganda" designed to paint Osama bin Laden and Al-Qaeda as the official "false flag" in the 9-11 attacks.

All of this suspicion surrounding Mohammed goes back even to the first attack on the World Trade Center in 1993.

Do not forget—and this is critical to recall:

It was Mohammed's nephew (and longtime collaborator) Ramzi Yousef who was alleged to be the "brains" behind that terror bombing, and whom pro-Israel propagandists have also since claimed was "linked" to the bombing of the Murrah Building in Oklahoma City in 1995.

We first met Yousef in Chapter Eighteen where we noted that when a young Palestinian named Ahmad Ajaj was arrested at Kennedy Airport in New York in 1992 (on passport charges) and then later indicted and convicted (after the first World Trade Center attack) with having been a conspirator in that crime, Yousef was Ajaj's traveling companion at the time of his arrest.

But the significance of this, of course, is the fact that—as we have seen—the late investigative journalist Robert I. Friedman reported that *Yousef's associate Ajaj, appeared to have been recruited as a Mossad asset and deployed as an infiltrator in Islamic fundamentalist circles.*

In addition, as we have seen, there were other telling Israeli "links" to the strange circumstances surrounding both the instigation (and cover-up) of the first trade center bombing.

The bottom line is that, looking more closely at Yousef and his uncle, Khalid Shaikh Mohammed—the ostensible "mastermind" of 9-11, purportedly working on behalf of Osama bin Laden—we cannot help but conclude that these two key figures in this seeming "first family of terrorism" are the key to understanding that Israel's Mossad did have a behind-the-scenes role in manipulating what we know as Al-Qaeda and what part (or parts) some of its lower-level operatives played in 9-11.

Going back to the first attack on the World Trade Center, there were, in fact, already suspicions among many Islamic elements that there was much more to Ramzi Yousef than would meet the eye.

First of all, for years, there have been questions as to Ramzi Yousef's actual ethnic or cultural background, not to mention his very identity. He has variously been described (or otherwise described himself) as an "Iraqi" or as a Kuwaiti national or as a Baluchi, from Pakistan.

At the time Yousef was claiming to be an Iraqi, during his period operating in New York, prior to the first World Trade Center attack, there were many individuals of Arabic heritage who doubted it.

However, for those who were eager to link Saddam Hussein and Iraq to both attacks on the World Trade Center and, as some continue to do today, to the Oklahoma City bombing, Yousef's claim of Iraqi heritage has been quite convenient indeed, no matter what the truth.

Even John Miller and Michael Stone and Chris Mitchell, writing in a semi-official 9-11 account, entitled *The Cell: Inside the 9/11 Plot, and Why the FBI and CIA Failed to Stop It*, described Yousef as "a shadowy figure whose background is still veiled in myth and controversy."

In the end, according to an investigative report by Emily Fancher, of Columbia University's Graduate School of Journalism: "Yousef's identity was never settled in court." So the truth is that not even the United States government has actually—at least officially—determined if Yousef really is even an Arab or a Muslim.

What makes this little-reported anomaly so interesting is that, as we noted in some detail in Chapter Twenty-Three, there is a long history of Israel utilizing "*mista'arvim*"—Jews posing as Arabs—as part of its intelligence operations. So a very real question remains: Are the individuals known as Khalid Shaikh Mohammed and Ramzi Yousef really who they say they are and are they really Arabs or Muslims at all?

And if the uncle-and-nephew team really are Arabs and/or Muslims, the fact the nephew, Yousef, was working closely with a reported Israeli intelligence asset in the first WTC attack is still noteworthy indeed, particularly since the Israeli asset in question was himself an Arab.

And it's probably no coincidence, considering everything, that when Ramzi Yousef was finally taken into custody for his reported role in the first trade center attack, according to US Secret Service agent Brian Parr, "[Yousef] was friendly, he seemed relaxed and he actually seemed eager to talk to us."

That's precisely what one might expect from an Israeli agent, doing his job, spreading the Al-Qaeda legend for the benefit of his Israeli sponsors. It also likewise reflects the seemingly quite forthcoming nature of the "revelations" that are reported to have emerged from Yousef's uncle, Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, in laying out, for the 9-11 commission, the Israeli "false flag" implicating Osama bin Laden and Al-Qaeda as the driving force behind the events of September 11, 2001.

Of the actual trial of the conspirators in the first trade center bombing, the aforementioned Emily Fanher of Columbia University reported that Robert Precht, one of the defense lawyers, said that “We felt that there were unseen actors behind this. Neither defense lawyers or government knew who it was”—certainly a cryptic suggestion that there was indeed much more to the story above and beyond the concept that the trade center attack was simply the product of an Islamic fundamentalist terrorist conspiracy.

And it's probably worth noting that, during that trial, the law firm that represented the Palestinian, Ahmad Ajaj—the reputed Mossad asset inside the bombing conspiracy—on a *pro bono* (that is, for free) basis was Willkie, Farr & Gallagher, the “blue ribbon” Wall Street firm which included among its partners no less than Kenneth Bialkin, a longtime national chairman of the Anti-Defamation League, the American propaganda and intelligence conduit for Israel's Mossad.

Of that trial, R. T. Naylor—a professor of economics at McGill University in Montreal, an authority and consultant on financial fraud and author of *Satanic Purses: Money, Myth, and Misinformation in the War on Terror*—noted that:

The FBI labwork implicating the defendants was revealed to be faked, and the case against the man who rented the truck was so full of inconsistencies that it might well have failed—but for two things. The prosecution successfully played on the sentiments of the jury, and the defense tried to rely on contradictions in the prosecution case rather than presenting a proper rebuttal.

And it's worth recalling—as noted in Chapter Eighteen—that an Israeli woman (whom federal authorities refused to confirm or deny had ties to Israeli intelligence) was deeply involved with the individual who had rented the truck used in the trade center bombing in 1993.

Of Ramzi Yousef, the aforementioned Miller, Stone & Mitchell have noted some of the mystery surrounding how Yousef came to become involved with the Islamic fundamentalist group in New York that ultimately came to be implicated in the first trade center attack, saying that “There may always be a debate about Yousef's intended purpose, but the more pressing question is: *Who sent him?*” [Emphasis added.]

These authors also noted that Yousef's involvement in the first trade center attack had some significant consequences for what they referred to as the “ragtag battalion.” Whoever bore responsibility, they said, for Yousef's coming to the United States, Yousef's effect was “indisputable.”

According to the authors:

For one thing, [Yousef] helped professionalize the largely inept, undisciplined soldiers. For another, he radically changed the scale of their mission. Before Yousef's arrival, even the Twelve Jewish Locations plot was based on classic terrorist strategy; a series of small, local explosions whose primary objective was to terrify, not kill or maim.

Yousef had much bigger plans—to build a bomb powerful enough to topple the World Trade Towers, one into the other, with a potential death toll in the tens of thousands—many levels of magnitude beyond anything the others had previously imagined.

In fact, to the extent that this previously “ragtag” group did have terrorist plans, they had evidently decided to focus on twelve key Jewish targets in the New York City area.

Yousef—you see—changed that and shifted the focus away from specifically Jewish targets to a much more broad-ranging target: the World Trade Center. And this, it should be noted, is akin to the way famed “Arab terrorist” Abu Nidal—another mysterious figure—focused on other Arab targets but seldom, if ever, aimed at Jewish or Israel targets.

As far as the role of Yousef's uncle, Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, in the 9-11 attacks, Miller, Stone & Mitchell say Mohammed “seems to have been responsible at least for arranging the operation's secret funding, though some investigators have come to believe that Mohammed masterminded the attacks himself.”

In short, that while Mohammed did have some role in *facilitating* the attacks—specifically in the realm of raising funds—it is otherwise not absolutely certain that he was the *ultimate* mastermind as “some investigators” had concluded.

Meanwhile, the aforementioned R. T. Naylor of McGill University—reflecting on what precise relationship Mohammed, in fact, had with Osama bin Laden, public perception to the contrary—referred to Mohammed's alleged role in another purported terror operation (never carried out) known as “the Bojinka Plot,” which is said to have involved the crashing of airliners. Assessing one account of Bojinka, Naylor wrote:

[Bojinka] became an Al-Qaeda operation in retrospect not because it was planned by bin Laden but because the man into whose bank account some money allegedly for the plot had been placed was a brother-in-law of Osama's brother-in-law.

More pointedly, in reference to Mohammed's purported role in orchestrating 9-11 (presumably on bin Laden's behalf), Naylor noted a March 2, 2003 profile of Mohammed that appeared in *The Observer* and commented:

Assuming the events portrayed are roughly accurate, what emerges is that [Mohammed] ran his own operations and occasionally crossed paths with bin Laden or Ayman al-Zawahiri but that there was no "merger" of their terror capacities into a corporate whole to justify the management hierarchy notion.

In other words, Mohammed was neither the direct underling—or under the supervision or even necessarily working at the behest—of Osama bin Laden. What role Mohammed played in 9-11 was solely of his own making and the perception that bin Laden was ultimately behind Mohammed's ventures was simply just that: a perception. But it was a perception that the 9-11 commission (and the mass media) were eager to portray to the American people and the world.

However, neither the 9-11 commission nor the mass media were ever eager to explore the multiple connections, strange circumstances and anomalous bits of evidence linking Mohammed and Ramzi Yousef to the operations of Israel's Mossad over a very long period of time.

The truth is that there is much more to the Al-Qaeda network than meets the eye, and considering the power of the Israeli lobby in official Washington, it is no wonder that even the highest-ranking U.S. law enforcement officials would be loathe to pry too deeply into the covert Israeli connections of the Al-Qaeda figures who seem to be ubiquitous players in the various acts of terrorism that have rocked America in recent years. But these details are here for the historical record.

In a special report in the Oct/Nov. 1997 issue of *The Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, Richard H. Curtiss, a respected former U.S. diplomatic officer, pointed out that, in a number of notable cases of what appeared to be "Arab terrorism," the individuals involved seemed to have covert ties to Israeli intelligence.

Curtiss cited former Mossad operative Victor Ostrovsky who noted that, in fact, Israeli intelligence did indeed have a hand in manipulating Arab terrorist cells, and that "usually Arabs who were carrying out Israeli plans had no idea where the plans really originated."

And as far as terrorist operations against Americans by Israelis—disguised as "Arab" plots—Ostrovsky commented, "The point of all these Israeli operations is to convince Americans that they're in the same boat as Israel [fighting Arab terrorism]."

However, the Mohammed-Yousef affair isn't the end of it. It seems that "family connections" to 9-11 (and to Israel's role therein) just won't go away when it comes to the possibility that Arabs—working for Israel's Mossad—might have played a role in that tragedy.

Buried in a *New York Times* story on Feb. 19, 2009 was the eye-opening revelation that a Lebanese Muslim Arab who had been taken into custody by Lebanon—which accused him of being a spy for some 25 years for Israeli intelligence—just happened to be a cousin of one of the Muslims alleged to have been one of the 9-11 hijackers.

Although Ali al-Jarrah was—publicly—an outspoken proponent of the Palestinian cause, it turned out that he was actually working as a paid asset of the Mossad for more than two decades, betraying his own nation and conducting spying operations against Palestinian groups and the pro-Palestinian party Hezbollah. Reporting on the al-Jarrah affair, *The New York Times* revealed this:

It is not the family's first brush with notoriety. One of Mr. Jarrah's cousins, Ziad al-Jarrah, was among the 19 hijackers who carried out the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001.

The *Times* added that the men were 20 years apart in age and "do not appear to have known each other well.

However, the gratuitous *Times* suggestion that the two cousins "do not appear to have known each other well" is intriguing, inasmuch as it is an admission that they did, in fact, know one another.

And that could be very telling, for there are those who have suggested that the older cousin may indeed have recruited his younger cousin (alleged to have been one of the 9-11 hijackers) as an asset (even an unknowing one) for Israeli intelligence.

The circumspect stance taken by the *Times* is no surprise, considering the fact that the *Times* was quite aware that there have been many sources which have alleged that the 9-11 conspiracy was infiltrated, if not controlled outright, by Israeli intelligence from the beginning.

If the younger al-Jarrah was an Israeli asset inside the 9-11 conspiracy, this would not be (as we have seen) the first time a Muslim Arab was involved, acting as a Mossad agent, in an attack on the World Trade Center. And the truth is that if—out of the archives of many different intelligence agencies—we could glean more about the purported participants in the 9-11 conspiracy, we would find, most assuredly, that the strange tale of the al-Jarrah family and that of Khalid Shaikh Mohammed and Ramzi Yousef are really only just the tip of the iceberg relating to the Mossad's tentacles inside Islamic fundamentalist circles linked to 9-11.

While some 9-11 “truthers” seem to be convinced that there were absolutely no Muslim fundamentalists involved (even at least indirectly) in orchestrating the 9-11 attacks—that it was all plotted by the Illuminati or the Bush family and the military-industrial complex and then carried out by the CIA or some combine of other government agencies—this is, of course, sheer fantasy.

And it flies in the face of what we *do* know about the manner in which Israel has not only manipulated very real (call them “sincere”) Islamic hard-liners, but *also* of what we know of Israel’s deployment of Jews (masquerading as Arabs or Muslims) into Muslim and Arab organizations (terrorist and otherwise) *and* utilizing genuine Arabs—who’ve turned traitor—as assets inside those networks.

And that having been said, it appears—based on all that we have examined here, thus far, in these pages—Israel’s Mossad did indeed engage in some behind-the-scenes trickery used to manipulate Islamic fundamentalist elements—before and on 9-11—in order to achieve what it hoped to accomplish on 9-11 and did:

The 9-11 tragedy pushed America and its people onto a new path, in direct confrontation with the entire Islamic world. Once again, it was “Onward Christian Soldiers.” American men and women in uniform were deployed in what was really and simply and only but another war for Israel’s survival, this one cleverly dubbed “the War on Terror.”

The New American National Enemy—really an enemy of the entire world if truth be told—was never so vague as the old Communist bogeyman. (What was Communism anyway?)

This time the New American National Enemy’s image and motivation was unquestionably clear. He had a face: the hook-nosed Arab wrapped in desert garb. An agenda: world conquest. A holy book: the Koran. And a prophet named Muhammed who followed a mysterious God named Allah, said to be “different” from the “good” God worshiped by Christians and their Jewish brethren alike.

This enemy hated Americans and God’s Chosen People and anything decent, determined to wipe Christianity and Israel and democracy and all nice things off the map and set up a worldwide Islamic dictatorship where good Christian girls would be sex slaves.

But Israel’s successful path to 9-11—by way of deception, if you will—was made possible because of the fact Israel (as we have seen) had a long and proven-quite-successful history of utilizing false flags (even on American soil) to achieve its ends.

In the chapter which follows, we’ll demonstrate how Arab false flags were utilized in Israel’s historic template for terror that had already been tested in the JFK assassination and the Oklahoma City bombing.

CHAPTER TWENTY-SIX:

Onward Christian Soldiers! What Really Happened on 9-11: Israel's Most Spectacular False Flag Triumph

A pivotal aspect of Israel's method of operation in utilizing "false flags"—as demonstrated in the JFK assassination and the Oklahoma City bombing—was the careful attachment (call it an "overlay") of Israel's conspiratorial aims onto the framework of existing political, military, intelligence and other structures of social interaction already in place in the United States, those elements necessary for not only implementing Israel's criminal terrorist agenda, but also (obviously) to ultimately shift the blame for the crimes elsewhere.

And that is precisely what Israel's "template for terror" has been all about: Israel has mustered its own considerable resources—finance, media power, wide-ranging covert capabilities—and then set them in place to manipulate ongoing events and operations being conducted quite independently by otherwise loyal Americans and direct those activities toward fulfilling Israel's agenda.

This is precisely what happened on 9-11. Israel's manipulation and deployment of "bin Laden Arabs" (as false flags) was carried out in a template for terror that used as its foundation the very American national security and defense structure that was designed to prevent the very type of attacks that took place on September 11, 2001.

And that, it might be said, was the unnatural "beauty"—the genius—of what Israel did that day. We have to give credit where credit is due. Throughout their history—going back to the days of the Old Testament—the Jewish people have shown a mad brilliance when dealing with their foes, both real and perceived. And 9-11 may well be their masterwork. (And let it be their last.)

Now since 9-11 there has been—as in the JFK assassination and the Oklahoma City bombing—a wide array of questions that have been raised about the specific events surrounding the actual events of what took place on 9-11. Untold numbers of books, Internet websites, monographs, videos and other media have gone to great lengths to prove (and, I think, adequately document beyond question) that the 9-11 story told by the U.S. government and its friends in Israel and in the Jewish-controlled mass media in the West is a pack of lies.

Many of these efforts deserve great credit for their accomplishments. Others are confusing and often internally contradictory, sometimes ill-thought-out slap-dash productions that are sometimes almost unintentionally comic in nature. Likewise, many of these books and other materials often contain very valuable data that is otherwise inter-

persed with disinformation and misinformation. How much of that combination is deliberate or simply mistaken is anyone's guess.

And then, of course, there are those 9-11 truthers who just simply avoid mentioning the possibility of Israeli involvement at all. Notable among them is Professor David Ray Griffin of Claremont University whose work on 9-11 is, otherwise, quite lucid and instructive.

Former senior CIA official Bill Christison said that Professor Griffin's book, *Debunking 9-11 Debunking*, was "a superb compendium of the strong body of evidence showing the official U.S. government story of what happened on September 11, 2001 to be almost certainly a monstrous series of lies."

And that pretty much sums up the official version of 9-11 itself: a monstrous series of lies. Only a person with a naive faith in "our government" would accept the lies of 9-11. And if truth be told, multiple polls taken over an extended period of time indicate that many Americans have serious doubts about what really happened that day—and why. But the thesis that Israel was the key player behind 9-11 has not yet fully seeped into the American awareness—and we certainly understand what that happens to be the case.

But people do understand that a wide variety of evidence come from notably disparate sources—including unchallenged experts in the respective fields—indicates, among other things:

- That the alleged 9-11 hijackers (whose actual identities still remain in doubt) had neither the skill to carry out some of the aerobatic maneuvers demonstrated that day and that, even further, it seems as if the planes themselves were taken over—from elsewhere—by remote control and, by this means, were made to hit their targets on 9-11.

- That the official rendition of how the World Trade Center towers collapsed is clearly untenable—scientifically impossible. There were clearly bombs or other explosives inside the ill-fated landmark towers and the popular perception that the collapse of the structures was reminiscent of a controlled demolition correctly reflected, in fact, what did happen to those buildings.

- That United Flight 93—the plane lost over Pennsylvania—was not brought down by a struggle between heroic passengers and the hijackers but was, instead, shot down by the U.S. military.

- That it was not American Flight 77 which struck the Pentagon on 9-11, but that some other unidentified flying object (generally assumed by 9-11 skeptics to have been a missile) was, in fact, the cause of the damage to America's military command center in Washington.

Naturally, all of these specific matters are—and have been—open to relentless debate.

As many readers may (or may not) know, there are even some 9-11 skeptics who make the serious claim that there were “no hijackers” involved in the events of that day.

Others claim that there not even any actual planes involved (even in the events at the World Trade Center).

And yet others claim that nuclear bombs brought down the trade towers, while others insist the towers were crippled and destroyed by powerful particle beam weapons which seem right out of science fiction but which are a reality.

In the end, however—and note this carefully:

None of this ultimately counts in understanding the actual and specific manner in which Israel utilized its tried-and-true false flag tactic, its proven template for terror, in carrying off the 9-11 tragedy.

While all of these debates about how the trade towers were brought down—and whether Building 7 was imploded, for example—are fascinating and provide 9-11 truthers a lot of interesting discussion (and entertaining reading for those interested in the topic of conspiracy theories) *they are debates that distract from the big picture.*

And that big picture is that, in the end, Israel was the mastermind behind 9-11, the tragedy that laid the path for the War on Terror—the latest in so many Jewish wars of survival that have plagued mankind throughout history. And even today, the consequences of 9-11 still place America (and the world) on the precipice of global disaster.

It will be a bitter pill to swallow for those who delight in inspecting and microanalyzing and pursuing to the end the questions of whether or not a plane or a drone or a missile hit the Pentagon or what super-secret scientific process was used to topple the trade towers, but (in the context of the events of 9-11) we cannot help recall what Vincent Salandria and Richard Sprague said in reference to the JFK assassination, remarks we cited at the very outset of this volume; to wit:

Salandria said:

While the [JFK assassination] researchers have involved themselves in consuming preoccupation with the microanalytic searching for facts of how the assassination was accomplished, there has been almost no systematic thinking on why President Kennedy was killed.

And Sprague said:

As incredible as it may seem . . . the identities of the actual Dealey Plaza team, including shooters, radio communications

men, coordinators, and others, do not really matter in the overall conspiracy and especially in the cover-ups. The murder was a carefully orchestrated intelligence operation

Lee Harvey Oswald did not fire any shots that day. Once one moves beyond the stage of thinking that Oswald did the shooting, the questions about who was shooting become secondary to the questions about who *planned* and *commanded* the execution and *why* they did so. [Sprague's emphasis.]

The bottom line of the Kennedy assassination was the JFK was killed. That was the intent of the plotters. The bottom line of the Oklahoma bombing was the destruction of the Murrah Building. And the bottom line of 9-11 was mass murder on a grand scale in multiple cities.

In each of these instances, Israel stood to benefit. It didn't matter what means were used, how many assassins or hijackers or bombers were deployed. It didn't make any difference, ultimately, in achieving Israel's final goal of shaping American policy for its own ends.

That is why the relentless debate over the specific forensics of 9-11 is a needless and distracting enterprise.

We KNOW that the official version of 9-11 is a lie and for those who aren't afraid of facing it (or saying it) we KNOW that Israel was the prime player behind the 9-11 tragedy.

We KNOW that Israel used bin Laden and fundamentalist Muslims as the false flags in 9-11.

And we KNOW that Israel had a very specific template for terror in place when they carried off 9-11.

And this is what it was . . .

In the JFK assassination, Israel either set up a "dummy assassination attempt" against JFK and made it into "the real thing" or otherwise manipulated an already existing such operation (put in place by elements in the CIA) and utilized it for its own ends.

To say precisely what happened would be speculative, but we know the basic parameters.

In the Oklahoma bombing, a similar template was utilized.

There, it seems, some sort of surveillance-and-sting operation aimed at domestic American "right wing" dissidents—whether militia or white separatists or a combination thereof—was either set up or otherwise co-opted and made into a full-fledged bombing that resulted in mass destruction.

Again, to say precisely what happened would be speculative, but we know the basic parameters.

In both instances, chosen patsies were already in place and there were also people and circles within various intelligence agencies that were either outright traitors, working on behalf of Israel, or who were otherwise unwittingly manipulated in order to carry out the various processes that facilitated these crimes.

In the case of 9-11, Israel “piggybacked” atop ongoing U.S. national defense systems designed to simulate and respond to air attacks and even including—the evidence now indicates—attacks on American landmarks and installations conducted by suicide aircraft.

Meanwhile, of course, Arab Islamic fundamentalist patsies—perhaps even directed or actually even led by Israeli Jews posing as Arabs (the mysterious “*mista’arvim*” described earlier)—were acting out their role as the 9-11 hijackers.

Their “hijacking” operation had been set in motion not by bin Laden but by Khalid Shaikh Mohammed who—the evidence suggests—was a longtime Israeli asset inside the Islamic fundamentalist movement.

The Israelis knew that, on 9-11, the United States defense apparatus was engaged in these training exercises and saw this as a perfect opportunity to spring the 9-11 trap on the American people. They knew that the American defense apparatus would be caught unaware and that unusual activity among a number of aircraft on the East Coast would, at least initially, be perceived to be part of the exercise.

Noting that U.S. air defenses were effectively paralyzed for an hour and forty-five minutes on 9-11—in comparison with an average intercept time of 15-20 minutes at most both before and after 9-11—one 9-11 researcher, Webster Griffin Tarpley, has summarized the matter:

Recent progress in 9-11 research has focused on the role of war games, military exercises, and terror drills in hiding and facilitating the terror actions of 9-11. So far we know of 14 separate exercises on or related to 9-11. Some were used to suppress air defenses by moving fighter planes to northern Canada and Alaska, far from the 9-11 targets. Others paralyzed air defense by inserting false radar blips onto the radar screens of defense personnel, and with commercial and military aircraft which reported themselves as hijacked.

Tarpley—among others—has concluded that rogue American military officers in NORAD and a number of civilian intriguers inside the Federal Aviation Administration were undoubtedly cognizant of the bigger conspiracy. But it should be noted, for the record, that Tarpley does not point the finger so directly at Israel as we do here.

Kristen Breitweiser, one of the more prominent and perceptive of the widely-publicized 9-11 widows made this critical point, appearing on Phil Donahue's television show:

I don't understand how a plane could hit our Defense Department . . . an hour after the first plane hit the first tower. I don't understand how that is possible. I'm a reasonable person.

But when you look at the fact that we spend half a trillion dollars on national defense and you're telling me that a plane is able to hit our Pentagon . . . an hour after the first tower is hit?

There are procedures and protocols in place in this nation that are to be followed . . . and they were not followed on September 11.

All of this happened not because a small group of Islamic fundamentalists (who obviously had no access to high-level inside knowledge of American defense operations) were able to somehow break through a sudden lapse in the security apparatus, but, instead, because Israel's intelligence service (with its wide-ranging contacts—and spies—inside the American defense establishment) were able to glean this data.

In his 2004 book, *A Pretext for War: 9/11, Iraq, and the Abuse of America's Intelligence Agencies*, James Bamford described the set-up of the pivotal North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) and the relevant security exercises in place in these brief terms:

September 11, 2001 was the fourth day of a week-long exercise code-named "Vigilant Guardian." It was designed to create a fictional crisis affecting the United States and test the network of radar watch stations around the country. Like a rerun of an old movie, the scenario involved Russian bombers flying over the North Pole in attack formation.

[Radar specialists in NORAD's Rome, New York-based Operations Command Center of "Huntress Control"—the Air National Guard's Northeast Air Defense Sector] were responsible for monitoring more than half a million square miles of airspace, from the Montana-North Dakota border to the coast of Maine down through South Carolina. Included were the skies over New York City and Washington, D.C.

Should a crisis develop, the radar specialists could pick up a phone and alert fighter pilots at National Guard units at Burlington, Vermont; Atlantic City, New Jersey, Cape Cod Massachusetts; and Duluth, Minnesota.

In addition, aside from these NORAD exercises, a similar National Reconnaissance Office drill was being conducted on September 11, in the Department of Defense/National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) which is in charge of spy satellites. The NRO exercise was scheduled to simulate the crash of a small aircraft into one of the agency's headquarters towers and test the response of employees thereto.

While no actual plane was to be involved in the exercise, an NRO officer said (after 9-11) that: "It was just an incredible coincidence that this happened to involve an aircraft crashing into our facility. As soon as the real world events began, we canceled the exercise." So while it may indeed have appeared to be a "coincidence" to the unknowing, it was a coincidence intended by America's "ally," Israel.

And as far as NORAD's response, in dealing with its own specific exercise in place, the aforementioned Bamford revealed that—initially—Lt. Col. Dawne Deskins (the airborne control and warning officer on duty at the Rome center) thought that the first report of a possible hijacking was "part of the exercise." Her reaction was in response to the first report of a hijacked plane coming from a Boston military liaison with the Federal Aviation Administration who urged NORAD be notified.

Major General Larry Arnold commander of the Continental United States NORAD Region, testified before the 9-11 Commission:

[We] were in the middle of a NORAD exercise at that particular time. Which means, that basically our entire staff was focused on being able to do the air operations center mission, which was our job to do.

We had just come out of a video teleconference with the NORAD staff and with our folks at that particular time when I was handed note that we had a possible hijacking in Boston Center. . . . I immediately went downstairs and picked up the phone, asking on the way to my staff, is this part of the exercise? Because quite honestly and frankly, we do do hijacking scenarios as we go through these exercises from time-to-time.

But I realized that it was not - that this was real-life.

Northeast Air Defense Sector (NEADS), Mission Crew Commander (MCC) Major Kevin Nasypany told *Vanity Fair*: "When they told me there was a hijack, my first reaction was 'Somebody started the exercise early. . . . I actually said out loud, 'The hijack's not supposed to be for another hour.'"

But the hijackings were "for real" and Israel had expertly manipulated the American defense apparatus from within to facilitate them.

Meanwhile, on the public stage, so to speak, the hijackers—including perhaps a few Israeli *mista'arvim* (Jews posing as Arabs) willing to sacrifice themselves for the greater good—were playing their roles.

However, it is entirely possible—even likely—that some of the hijackers had no idea that they were *not* engaging in a conventional hijacking and that their planes would *actually* be crashed into the Pentagon and the World Trade Center and other landmarks.

And in that regard, there is a wide body of opinion—and scientific reality to verify the possibility—that it is likely that the internal flying mechanisms of at least some of the 9-11 airliners were commandeered via remote control (from the ground) and steered toward disaster and that the hijackers on the planes had no means to stop it.

That is, while those hijackers may have believed that they were going to land the planes at some location and then presumably make demands upon the American government—a typical scenario in a conventional hijacking—they had no idea that the planes, in fact, would be taken over by remote control from elsewhere and caused to crash.

We can't pretend to know the motivations of each and every one of the individuals who were on those planes in the role of "hijacker," and nor do we even really know who they were in the first place, the official version of events notwithstanding.

And in this regard, it should be noted for the record, that there is yet another odd twist to the matter of the hijackers: the strong likelihood that at least a number of the alleged hijackers had actually received training (including flight training) on American military bases.

This little known point has been made by a wide variety of sources, even including elements in the mainstream media and yes—although many are loathe to mention it—this matter also involves both Israel *and* simulation exercises involving hijackings. (Akin again to the "dummy assassination" in Dallas and the "sting-gone-wrong" in Oklahoma City).

In perhaps his only passing reference to a role by Israel in 9-11, Michael Ruppert asserted in his book *Crossing the Rubicon*:

... The so-called hijackers who had received this training were probably part of an ultra-secret U.S. military and intelligence joint operation "Opposition Force," or OPFOR, which routinely played bad guys in hijack exercises around the world and inside the U.S. . . . It is possible—even likely—that this hijack OPFOR was a joint U.S-Israeli operation. Sources [told Ruppert] that exercises like this were also probably used by U.S. and Israeli intelligence agencies to test airline security around the world and especially in the Middle East.

Ruppert pointed out that over many years he had met multiple former U.S. Special operations personnel “who performed these kinds of missions,” which, he said, included “driving a pick truck or a fake utility truck to test defenses at nuclear reactors, or posing as small boaters attempting to penetrate the security at submarine bases.”

So what role at least some of the alleged hijackers were playing (or thought they were playing) on 9-11 is anyone’s guess.

Did some of them actually believe that they were actually working on behalf of a joint U.S.-Israeli hijacking exercise, only to find out that they were, in the end, slated to be patsies?

We can only imagine how some of them might have reacted when they realized—as many have suggested—that the planes they hijacked had actually been *taken over by remote control and then delivered to a fiery crash into the trade towers.*

And, again, for the record, all we know is the purported identities of those accused of having been involved in the events of 9-11, although we also know that some of those people are very much still alive.

And the very fact that some of these purported hijackers—whom we are now led to believe had multiple connections to “terrorism”—made it onto the planes in the first place is probably no coincidence. We know an Israeli company, ICTS, was providing security at the Boston airport from which two of the 9-11 flights originated. And either directly or through subsidiaries, ICTS was operating security at the airports in Washington and Newark where the other 9-11 flights originated.

One could easily surmise that the hijackers were thus permitted to gain entry to those departing aircraft precisely because the Israelis *wanted* those individuals aboard those planes. And in light of what did happen on 9-11 we have a pretty good idea as to *why* the Israelis wanted those individuals—the false flag patsies—aboard those planes.

Israel’s “control” of the 9-11 hijackers can be traced to multiple means, all or some which could have been utilized to one degree or another (and considering the fact that there were said to have been nineteen “hijackers” on 9-11, the options, naturally, can vary.

But what follows is probably about as precise a summary as possible of the means by which Israel orchestrated the presence of the purported hijackers onto the aircraft that became the weapons of 9-11.

Ultimately, the orders for the 9-11 conspiracy came from Israel. The orders were passed down and carried out through Israeli assets inside Islamic fundamentalist circles. Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, discussed in some detail earlier, seems the likely conduit and was indeed the 9-11 “mastermind”—but working for Israel, nor working for Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda.

Whether Mohammed is actually Jewish is a very real question, but, in the end it doesn't really matter, for whatever his ethnic origins the evidence strongly suggests that Mohammed and his partner-in-crime, his nephew Ramzi Yousef, were longtime assets of Israeli intelligence.

It has long been known—among Muslim and Arab communities in the Washington, DC area—that one of the individuals who was involved in providing false identification papers for a number of the 9-11 hijackers (when they were in the Maryland-Virginia area) has been a longtime asset of Israeli intelligence, despite his Arab background.

So it was Israeli intelligence that had a direct hand in assisting at least several of the 9-11 hijackers in the months preceding 9-11, whether or not those purported hijackers actually knew it or not. Those hijackers, in fact, may well have been “sincere” Islamic fundamentalists who had been selected (by Israel) to be among the patsies and, as a consequence, making it possible for them to travel on 9-11 was critical to bringing all of the pieces of Israel's 9-11 conspiracy into place.

And it is a fact that the prosecution of another of the individuals—an American woman—involved in facilitating the forged papers for those hijackers was brushed under the rug.

Clearly, it was determined too much inquiry into the matter might start uncovering things that the Israelis (and their collaborators in high places in the United States government) would prefer under wraps.

Some of the hijackers could very well have been Israeli Jews—the previously-described *mista'arvim*—posing as Arabs, knowing that they were on a suicide mission (although this possibility is least likely).

At any rate, *mista'arvim* undoubtedly played a part in manipulating some of the now-infamous “19 hijackers” into the roles that they ultimately were said to have played on 9-11, whether any *mista'arvim* were actually on any of the ill-fated 9-11 flights or not.

Some of the hijackers could very well have been—as outlined earlier—Arabs who had been trained by the United States (and Israel) for participation in hijacking exercises and participated in the events of 9-11, not knowing what was actually intended.

The Israelis could have manipulated these Arabs into involvement in 9-11 even without the knowledge of the United States defense and intelligence apparatus, and, at the same time, leading those Arabs to believe that they were, in fact, working *under* U.S. government auspices in some sort of hijacking exercise.

And while my report for *American Free Press*—speculating on the likely role of Israeli Jews posing as Arabs being involved in 9-11—first appeared in 2001, a more detailed exposition of this thesis appeared elsewhere, a decade later, in early 2011.

The author, Washington journalist Wayne Madsen—who is as fervent in his opposition to Nazism as he is in exposing the intrigues of Israel—is no “Nazi sympathizer” by any means. Madsen reported that he had received details of a Feb. 2002 British intelligence memorandum (suppressed by then-Prime Minister Tony Blair) which flatly asserted that Israel had, in fact, set up and manipulated the hijackers involved in 9-11. The relevant portion of Madsen’s report follows:

A Mossad unit consisting of six Egyptian- and Yemeni-born Jews infiltrated "Al-Qaeda" cells in Hamburg (the Atta-Mamoun Darkanzali cell), south Florida, and Sharjah in the United Arab Emirates in the months before 9/11. The Mossad not only infiltrated cells but began to run them and give them specific orders that would eventually culminate in their being on board four regularly-scheduled flights originating in Boston, Washington Dulles, and Newark, New Jersey on 9/11.

The Mossad infiltration team comprised six Israelis, comprising two cells of three agents, who all received special training at a Mossad base in the Negev Desert in their future control and handling of the "Al-Qaeda" cells.

One Mossad cell traveled to Amsterdam where they submitted to the operational control of the Mossad's Europe Station, which operates from the El Al complex at Schiphol International Airport. The three-man Mossad unit then traveled to Hamburg where it made contact with Mohammed Atta, who believed they were sent by Osama bin Laden. In fact, they were sent by Ephraim Halevy, the chief of Mossad.

The second three-man Mossad team flew to New York and then to southern Florida where they began to direct the "Al-Qaeda" cells operating from Hollywood, Miami, Vero Beach, Delray Beach, and West Palm Beach.

Israeli "art students," already under investigation by the Drug Enforcement Administration for casing the offices and homes of federal law enforcement officers, had been living among and conducting surveillance of the activities, including flight school training, of the future Arab "hijacker" cells, particularly in Hollywood and Vero Beach.

In August 2001, the first Mossad team flew with Atta and other Hamburg "Al-Qaeda" members to Boston. . . .

The two Mossad teams sent regular coded reports on the progress of the 9/11 operation to Tel Aviv via the Israeli embassy in Washington, DC.

So what Madsen claimed—but which has largely been ignored by many in the 9-11 truth movement—fits all that we know about the method of operation used by Israel, both in terms of its use of *mis-ta'arvim* and the infiltration of Islamic fundamentalist circles and underscores much of what I've written in *American Free Press* and reiterated to a certain degree in the pages of this volume.

And although readers of my work might be inclined, as Jewish sources do, to dismiss me as an “anti-Semitic conspiracy theorist”—an apparently negative appellation I cheerfully acknowledge for its basic accuracy—such a description is hard to apply to Wayne Madsen.

As a U.S. Naval Officer, he managed one of the first computer security programs for the U.S. Navy. He subsequently worked for the National Security Agency, the Naval Data Automation Command, the Department of State, RCA Corporation, and Computer Sciences Corporation—a distinguished resume by any estimation!

Interestingly, Madsen also contended in that report that Egyptian- and Yemeni-born Jewish Mossad agents had infiltrated the Muslim Brotherhood in the United Arab Emirates and had helped expedite Israeli funding for activities to be attributed to Al-Qaeda.

Earlier, according to Madsen, John O'Neill—who had been the FBI's chief counter-terrorism agent investigating Al-Qaeda—had become aware of the Israeli funding mechanisms and “It was no mistake,” editorialized Madsen, “that O'Neill was given the job as director of security for the World Trade Center on the eve of the attack. O'Neill perished in the collapse of the complex.”

Whatever the circumstances of O'Neill's death, what we do know is that prior to 9-11 there *were* a number of people in the United States intelligence and law enforcement apparatus—particularly in the FBI—who stumbled upon disturbing information relating to possible terrorist activities by “Arabs” and “Islamic extremists” and that, when they sought to investigate further, they found their efforts were frustrated.

After 9-11 the efforts of such individuals as FBI Special Agent Colleen Rowley in Minneapolis, Kenneth Williams, the senior special agent from an FBI terrorism task force in Phoenix, Chicago-based FBI Special Agent Robert Wright and others came to public attention.

But the fact that their warnings about possible terrorist activity and/or connections by some of those whose names were linked to 9-11 was largely dismissed as a yet another unfortunate bureaucratic blunder, a terrible snafu, just so typical of “our” government today.

“Wasn't it a tragedy,” they said, “that people didn't pay attention to what Colleen Rowley and others had to say? That might have stopped 9-11 from happening. More government incompetence.”

Our contention here is that the efforts of these FBI agents were suppressed not because of bureaucratic bungling or incompetence but precisely because there was absolute knowledge—at higher levels—that the future hijackers were, in fact, under the control and direction of Israeli intelligence (and/or perceived to be likewise under the control and direction of American intelligence) and that this is why their activities were allowed to continue and why the FBI agents' warnings were deliberately ignored and suppressed.

It is doubtful that even most (if any) of those people at the higher (even the highest) levels had any idea that an event like 9-11 was slated to happen. They were simply aware that “this is an Israeli operation” or “this is a joint U.S.-Israeli operation,” so therefore, “let it alone.”

These people believed that the activities facilitating the 9-11 conspiracy, moving it along through its course of planning and development, were actually anti-terrorist monitoring operations being conducted by “our ally”—Israel—as part of its vaunted infiltration and manipulation of Islamic fundamentalist forces (details of which we've already delved into in the pages of this volume).

It was a perfect cover for Israel's historic false flag template for terror—and one that was carefully crafted to prevent persons holding high-level security clearances from going public with any knowledge that they did have about the operations.

And this brings us to Able Danger.

A joint project of the Defense Intelligence Agency and the Special Forces Command, Able Danger was a highly-classified counter-terrorism operation that was the one U.S. government surveillance operation that almost certainly picked up on the Israeli-controlled “Al-Qaeda” operation—the 9-11 conspiracy.

Sidelined four months before 9-11 by the Bush administration—and this action most assuredly involved high-level forces loyal to (or otherwise compromised by) Israeli intelligence—Able Danger had already been substantially eviscerated as far back as mid-2000 when—under the direction of the U.S. Army Intelligence and Security Command—vast amounts of computerized data compiled by Able Danger were destroyed.

According to some accounts, the amount of material eliminated was equal to the modern-day holdings of the Library of Congress.

After 9-11, Army Lt. Colonel Anthony Shaffer, the Defense Intelligence Agency's liaison to Able Danger, brought Able Danger's existence to the public and suffered widespread repudiation for having done so, particularly in response to his claims that the dismantling of Able Danger had played a part in essentially allowing 9-11 to happen.

In other words, Shaffer said that because Able Danger had been shut down, this crippled any serious effort to monitor the activities of those who were involved in the very operations that were underway and which resulted in the tragedy that we recall today as 9-11.

Responding to revelations from Shaffer and other Able Danger whistleblowers who came forth in response to Shaffer's public allegations, then-Rep. Curt Weldon (R-Pa) issued a press statement on August 12, 2005 describing Able Danger

The task assigned to Able Danger was to identify and target Al-Qaeda on a global basis and, through the use of cutting edge technology (data-mining, massive parallel processing, neural networking and human factors analysis) and enhanced visualization and display tools, present options for leaders (national command authority) to manipulate, degrade or destroy the global Al-Qaeda infrastructure.

Naturally, of course, Shaffer never suggested that Able Danger had uncovered any behind-the-scenes Israeli connections to the "Al-Qaeda" terrorists. Whether he knew (or suspected) this to be the case is another question altogether, and it's highly unlikely that Shaffer would have gone public with any such suspicions under any circumstances

However, the truth is Able Danger's capacity to monitor the activities of longtime Mossad asset Khalid Shaikh Mohammed and the 9-11 patsies—being handled "on the ground" by *mista'arvim* Jews, posing as Arabs—would have certainly provided a virtually indisputable and all-too-clear overview of the patterns and connections of the Israeli sources of funding and intelligence that helped facilitate the 9-11 attacks.

And that's why it was so vital that the reality of what Able Danger represented be thoroughly repudiated and publicly discredited. A serious analysis of Able Danger's data would have pointed directly at Israel and the Mossad for its central role in directing the 9-11 conspiracy.

To no one's surprise, the 9-11 Commission was careful to do its utmost to undercut Shaffer and Weldon and others who were raising questions about Able Danger. In his aforementioned press statement, Weldon described the 9-11 Commission's prevarications:

The 9/11 Commission has released multiple statements over the past week, each of which has significantly changed — from initially denying ever being briefed to acknowledging being briefed on both operation Able Danger and [alleged "lead hijacker"] Mohammed Atta.

The information was omitted primarily because they found it to be suspect despite having been briefed on it two times by two different military officers on active duty. Additionally, the 9/11 Commission also received documents from the Department of Defense on Able Danger.

Despite their varied statements, two critical questions remain unanswered.

1) Why did the Department of Defense fail to pass critical information obtained through Able Danger to the FBI between the summer and fall of 2000?

2) Why did the 9/11 Commission staff fail to properly follow-up on the three separate occasions when they received information on Able Danger and Mohammed Atta?

These were all good questions and good concerns and Weldon was right to ask them.

If—however unlikely, of course—bin Laden Arabs in the Al-Qaeda network *had* been responsible for 9-11, as the official story went (and still goes), the fact that Able Danger and its intelligence capacities had been sidelined, its data ditched into oblivion, and its very existence and value being essentially denied is certainly a curious matter, by the estimation of any honest observer. And rightly so.

And that's why a lot of good people among the American public—who believed 9-11 was the consequence of a gigantic behind-the-scenes intelligence bungle—*a la* the “sting gone wrong” cover story in Oklahoma City—were demanding the U.S. government account for the Able Danger controversy and the questions that arose.

But the fact remains that nobody (at least publicly, of course) seemed to consider the possibility—the likelihood—that we've outlined here: that Able Danger's data would ultimately have implicated Israel as the real “mastermind” behind the 9-11 terrorist attacks.

Now Congressman Weldon declared that he would “continue to push for a full accounting of the historical record so that we may preclude these types of failures from happening again.” But any possibility of Weldon pursuing that agenda came to an effective end when he was defeated for reelection in 2006. Having come under fire in the media—quite conveniently—for alleged corruption involving his ties to defense contractors, the conservative Republican was forced out of office.

Whether the scandals surrounding Weldon were contrived for that purpose and directly attributable to concerns about his focus on Able Danger and its ramifications—that is, the potential danger of exposing Israel's behind-the-scenes role in 9-11—can only be speculated upon.

And it should be noted that, for the most part, Weldon's own political inclinations would not suggest he was inclined to pursue an agenda that would be injurious to Israel. Quite the contrary. Weldon was closely intertwined with many of the infamous "high priests of war"—pro-Israel neo-conservative elements in official Washington—a grand list of sordid intriguers whose names are familiar to those versed in the machinations that led to American involvement in Iraq and Afghanistan in the Jewish-inspired "War on Terror." And after leaving office, Weldon even published a book claiming Iran was conspiring to attack America.

On the other hand, on two matters, in particular, Weldon may have engaged in activities that impinged upon Israel's particular interests.

In one instance he took a quite independent stand from the Bush administration's aggressive stance toward North Korean nuclear weapons. In fact—although many people are unaware of this—it has long been an article of faith among pro-Israel zealots that North Korea's nuclear arsenal is a threat to Israel, a point that is not widely discussed in the major media, although commonly referenced in pro-Israel journals and in the opinion columns of Jewish community newspapers.

And in another respect—a strange twist—Weldon had, even while in Congress, forged an unusually close relationship with Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi—never, to say the least, a favorite of Israel—and members of his family.

Shortly before the so-called "Arab spring" revolution (orchestrated by the United States and Israel) that resulted in his brutal murder, Gaddafi had actually taken to the floor of the United Nations and echoed the thesis of my book, *Final Judgment*: That Israel had been behind the assassination of President Kennedy as a consequence of JFK's opposition to Israel's drive to acquire nuclear weapons.

In fact, right after *Final Judgment* was published, the Libyan Embassy in New York purchased three copies of the book and shortly thereafter I was invited to address the the topic of the book at the Second Green Dialogue for an Alternative World Order held in Tripoli, Libya by the Jamahir Society for Philosophy and Culture which was primarily sponsored by the Gaddafi government.

Unfortunately, because of restrictions against travel to Libya (imposed upon Americans by the pressure of the Israeli lobby), I felt it best not to attend and risk prosecution. However, the organizers asked me to submit a written statement which was read aloud to the participants who had come from all over the globe. In the aftermath I received letters from people as far away as Malta, Ghana and Guyana who were profoundly surprised to learn there are a few Americans unafraid to raise questions about the U.S. relationship with Israel.

In any case, after leaving Congress, Curt Weldon continued his close association with the Libyans, even to the point of becoming the first non-Libyan member of the Gaddafi Foundation. So the fact that Weldon was on such intimate terms with a “controversial” Arab leader who had actually accused Israel of involvement in the JFK assassination is an interesting point, whatever the case.

The bottom line is that it is hard to say precisely what motivated Weldon’s vocal public interest in pursuing the matter of Able Danger.

Weldon’s seemingly contradictory stands (as outlined above) make it impossible to divine exactly where the congressman was coming from, but, in the end, it may simply be that Weldon was sincerely concerned that hard-line Islamic fundamentalists (plotting against America) had been under surveillance and that for seemingly inexplicable reasons, their activities (being monitored by Able Danger) had been effectively disregarded.

And it should probably be mentioned that, in many respects, Muammar Gaddafi—although the Muslim leader of an Islamic state—was never, in fact, a favorite either of Israel or of the hard-line Islamic fundamentalists (whom he had suppressed during his years in power). So, in that sense, Weldon’s kinship with Gaddafi (and Weldon’s concerns about Islamic fundamentalist terror networks) were not necessarily mutually exclusive as some less nuanced observers might perceive.

While outlining these matters regarding Weldon’s involvement in bringing Able Danger to a greater public attention that it would have otherwise received, there were moments when I felt—for the sake of the readers—that much of this might be perceived to be a distraction or perhaps too much of a digression from the specific topic at hand.

However, I think the case of Weldon demonstrates that sometimes there is much more to some matters than meets the eye and that, contradictions notwithstanding, sometimes we can find someone engaged in an activity motivated by hidden factors not so easily defined.

Is it possible that Curt Weldon did, in fact, realize or learn (through some means) that Israel was indeed the driving force behind 9-11 and that he was utilizing his campaign to bring focus upon Able Danger to bring that matter into public discussion, if only through what might be described as “the back door”?

What we do know is that while the Jewish-controlled media did mention Able Danger, it was only in the context of furthering the official cover story that “bin Laden Arabs” were behind 9-11. And that perhaps through some unfortunate slip-up, the evidence that would have prevented the tragedy had somehow been lost in the netherworld of the American intelligence bureaucracy.

So there we have it. This was the template—the tried-and-true Israeli method of operation of false flag terrorism—designed to orchestrate the 9-11 attack on America to be blamed on Islamic terrorists. To summarize:

It was all really quite so simple in many respects and perhaps not so complicated as a lot of 9-11 truthers—even those who concur that Israel was involved—would have us believe.

Utilizing its long-time assets inside Islamic fundamentalist circles peripherally or even directly “linked” to Osama bin Laden—with the now-notorious Khalid Shaikh Mohammed at the pinnacle—Israel’s Mossad dispatched *mista’arvim* Jews (posing as Arabs) into key command posts, manipulating genuine do-or-die Islamic fundamentalists into a hijacking scheme keyed to take place precisely at the time when the United States defense and intelligence command was engaging in widespread hijacking drills and related exercises involving the use of airliners for the purpose of terrorism.

To what extent there was deliberate treason by American conspirators (in the military or otherwise) will never be precisely known, but, unfortunately, it seems likely that there were indeed treasonous actions by Americans that were taken on 9-11 that facilitated the conspiracy.

Whether those who engaged in those acts of treason did so out of loyalty to Israel for religious or ethnic reasons, whether they were American Jews or even Christian fundamentalist supporters of Israel, or perhaps even individuals who were compromised through blackmail or extortion or otherwise simply bought-and-paid for is yet another matter for speculation.

In the meantime, through whatever covert means, the Israelis were able to use their considerable resources to assure that any existing American intelligence monitoring of Islamic fundamentalist networks—namely Able Danger, for one known example (and there were probably others that we do not know about) was sidelined or otherwise altered and distorted so as to cover up Israel’s behind-the-scenes role.

On 9-11 the events we now recall—to the extent we really know what did happen (and even all of that is subject to debate—did indeed take place. In the end it doesn’t matter whether particle beam weapons or mini-nuclear weapons or other exotic scientific technology was used to bring down the trade towers, for example.

The bottom line is that the 9-11 tragedy did take place and it was utilized, quite successfully, by Israel and its allies in the Jewish-controlled media (with the willing assent of the American government under George W. Bush) to bring about a new paradigm in global affairs. Nothing would ever be the same again.

Even the Bush administration's official document, *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*, issued in 2002, said flatly: "The events of September 11, 2001 opened vast, new opportunities."

What opportunities they were!

The long-awaited "Clash of Civilizations"—feverishly enunciated by Zionist theoreticians—was now underway.

America was pushed into an un-ending "War on Terror"—one Jewish strategist, Norman Podhoretz, enthusiastically called it "World War IV"—and the United States became the driving force, the banker and the military might—behind a new imperialism, the framework for a would-be Jewish Imperium (a global planetary regime) often referred to as "the New World Order."

The ancient dream of Jewish rabbis—laid forth in the Talmud—of an ultimate Jewish rule over the peoples of the world came ever closer to being realized and that, from the beginning, was precisely the intent of Israel in making 9-11 happen.

The New Enemy to be vanquished was Islam and Americans were manipulated by the Jewish-controlled media—in the name of "patriotism" and "Americanism" and "fighting terrorism," and "homeland security"—to combat this dangerous enemy.

It was "Onward Christian Soldiers" once again.

In the JFK assassination and the Oklahoma City bombing, Israel's fine hand was always visible, although not in ways that many even more perceptive individuals might immediately see. But what we do know, as we've seen in these pages, is that the parallels between the mechanism used by Israel in these crimes—and later in 9-11—are all too clear when we push aside the distractions (deliberate and otherwise).

After my book on the JFK assassination (and Israel's involvement therein) was first published, one reader wrote me a remarkable letter in which he asserted:

You have been the chronicler of a great episode in Jewish history, the writer of an important book, a modern sort of Bible. You have shown—in their eyes—that their Mossad was justified in executing President Kennedy, especially as you paired it with the heroism of Esther. One nation's assassins are another nation's saviors. What is foreign policy to one nation may be warfare to another, and all's fair in war.

Israel's 9-11 attack on America—like the JFK assassination and the Oklahoma bombing—was an act of war that needs retribution.

CHAPTER TWENTY-SEVEN:

Two Simple Words . . .

Not long after the 9-11 attacks, a prominent attorney was visiting Washington, D.C. with his 18 year old son, preparing to register the boy for college. The attorney happens to be a long-time close friend of mine, and during their visit, my friend and his son joined me for a casual lunch at Union Station on Capitol Hill.

The attorney is conservative, politically and culturally, and instinctively a patriot in the truest sense. In addition, it should be noted, he had several family members who were active members of the elite media, including one who, during his heyday, was a very well-known journalist.

So my attorney friend is quite well-informed (more so than most Americans, perhaps), but he, too, relies almost entirely on the media monopoly for his news and information. He is not a reader of *American Free Press* (AFP)—but he (like all other good Americans) should be. Instead, unfortunately, he has become addicted to the Zionist-controlled Muslim-bashing Fox News—controlled by billionaire Rupert Murdoch, a front man for even wealthier Jewish families in the sphere of the Rothschild banking dynasty—for the “news” that he digests.

In any case, during our lunch, the subject of the 9-11 terrorist attacks and their aftermath was a major topic of discussion.

Pointing out that AFP had published numerous stories that presented a stark contrast to the “official” stories about 9-11 that had been handed down by the federal authorities and presented as “fact” by the media monopoly, I noted that, at the very least, there was a lot of information suggesting that, in order for 9-11 to have happened as it did, that there had to have been some foreknowledge (even cooperation) by persons in key places inside the U.S. defense establishment.

I added my opinion that most of those involved were undoubtedly willing assets of Israel and its “neo-conservative” lobby in Washington.

My friend expressed absolute horror at the thought.

“I absolutely refuse to believe,” he said firmly, his eyes flashing in indignation, “that anybody inside our own government would collaborate in those terrorist attacks or simply sit back and allow them to happen, knowing that thousands of people would die.”

I responded: “But don’t forget: those 3,000 lives were considered the necessary cost of getting us into a war that these people wanted to fight. And the only way they could get the American people riled up enough to support such a war was to have an incident like 9-11.”

My attorney friend shook his head.

“No, I don’t buy it. I just don’t buy it,” he insisted.

I responded: “It’s not something that anybody wants to be true, but

that's how these things work. These things *do* happen."

At that moment, my friend's 18-year-old son, who had been sitting quietly, listening, absorbing our exchange, piped up: "Yeah," he said, "What about Pearl Harbor?"

You could have heard a pin drop.

My friend's son looked a bit embarrassed for a moment, but his father looked even more embarrassed, since—in fact—his son had hit the nail on the head. The boy had made my point precisely: in two simple words: "Pearl Harbor."

Needless to say, I smiled from ear to ear and nodded my head and I said, "That's right. What about Pearl Harbor?"

I charged forward, invigorated by the young man's perspicuity:

"FDR wanted to get the United States into the war. He needed an incident like Pearl Harbor, and the Japanese gave it to him. Many historians now say not only that FDR knew, in advance, of the impending Japanese attack and precisely where it would happen, but that, in addition, FDR helped provoke the attack in the first place."

My attorney friend—who is otherwise articulate and quick on his feet—was hard-pressed to respond.

But it was clear that his son had made my point all too well.

So, diplomat that I am, I said, "Well, enough of that. Let's talk about the horse races."

There are a number of things that can be said about this simple story, but one thing is clear, at least to me, anyway: Young people in America are a lot smarter than a lot of world-wise adults might think.

Although young people have been subjected to a great deal of mind-bending propaganda programs in the schools and targeted by the brain-washing techniques of Hollywood and the Jewish-controlled major media, they still—when presented with facts and logic—have some capacity to make sound judgments.

As for those who—like my attorney friend—want to think the best of the people in "our" government and refuse to believe anyone inside that government played a part in 9-11, those two simple words—"Pearl Harbor"—point in a direction that truly does raise real questions about 9-11 that do need to be answered.

And one day they will be. Some call it Judgment Day.

In the years following that poignant conversation, I came to immortalize my attorney friend—in discussing him on a regular basis on my own Internet broadcasts—as "the Bigshot Lawyer."

Aware that he is painted in my broadcasts not really as a villain, but rather, in some respects, as a pathetic figure, my friend exemplifies (all too well) so many other good Americans who think as he does. He even

mentions to his own acquaintances, when introducing me to them, that “This guy attacks me on his radio show all the time.”

Many of my listeners have come to “know” the Bigshot Lawyer and they understand his particular mindset, since he reminds them of their own Bigshot Lawyers, that is, their friends and family who refuse to accept uncomfortable truths about what happened on 9-11 and with the Oklahoma bombing and the Kennedy assassination and so many other pivotal events in American history.

We can only pray—together—that all of those Bigshot Lawyers in our midst—and there are unfortunately all too many of them—will finally come around and join us in our fight for justice, our fight against the criminal forces that have manipulated us—and our nation—and people all over the planet in order to achieve their own insidious agenda.

But 9-11 was not the end of the conspiracies designed to advance this agenda.

If anything, in the wake of 9-11 and all the hoopla surrounding it—most of it manufactured by the Jewish-controlled media—we found our selves (our minds) being subjected to a relentless campaign of misinformation and disinformation and all manner of very real nonsense designed to confuse us and divide us and keep us preoccupied from focusing on the international cabal that has brought us to where we are today as a nation and as the people(s) of this planet.

The sad truth is that the rise of the Internet has brought about a state of affairs in which, on the one hand, while we now have much more information available about many more things than we ever had before, we also find there is *so much information* that we are often blinded and we cannot see the proverbial forest for the trees.

And much of that information popping up on the Internet is just not *good* information. Rather, it is outright propaganda, coming from people and sources that we perceive to be “on our side,” but who are, in fact, *working for the other side*.

In many respects, if truth be told, the Internet is even more insidious and unreliable a “source” than the obvious propaganda forces—the major print and broadcast media—that are all-too-obviously controlled by the global power elite.

In our closing chapters we will review this phenomenon and see the clear pattern of manipulation that has been deliberately contrived in order to mislead good people who are sincerely striving to undercover the hidden truths about some of the great tragedies of our time.

There are very real conspiracies enveloping our world today and one of the biggest conspiracies is that which is designed to actually divert and distract our attention from *the source* of those conspiracies.

CHAPTER TWENTY-EIGHT:

9-11 and the New Internet Paradigm: The Necessity for High-Level Manipulation and Control of the Dissemination of Information

Canadian Zionist conservative Jonathan Kay has been among the foremost critics of the growing number of people in the United States and around the globe who have questioned the official version of what really happened on September 11.

First referenced in Chapter 17, Kay's recent book—*Among the Truthers: A Journey Through America's Growing Conspiracist Underground*—outlines Kay's concerns about a variety of conspiracy theories, but makes clear his foremost worry is the blossoming of 9-11 conspiracies in particular and that an inordinate number of 9-11 "truthers" point the finger at Israel for that crime.

However, of course, the truth is that most 9-11 dissidents are still largely determined to direct the blame for 9-11 at George W. Bush or the CIA or "the military-industrial complex" or the Illuminati or some combination thereof. Many who do suspect Israeli complicity would just simply not even mention it.

And then, naturally—and this must be said—there are also considerable numbers of *agents provocateurs* who have infiltrated the 9-11 truth movement (just as they infiltrated the JFK assassination and Oklahoma City truth seekers) who are consciously (and often quite successfully) muddying the waters of research through their insertion of distractions and distortions that redirect focus away from the real conspirators responsible for those terrorist tragedies.

And this is something that is critical to remember: at the time of the JFK assassination there was no Internet. And at the time of the Oklahoma City bombing, the Internet was in its infancy.

The growing public awareness that something was wrong with the official explanation of the JFK assassination was largely stimulated through books, magazine articles, and lectures at small gatherings around the country by pioneer researchers such as Mark Lane and Penn Jones and others whose efforts were supplemented considerably by New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison's journey into the realm. Literally, word-of-mouth became—during the mid-1960s and beyond—one of the primary means of broadening discussion about the Warren Commission cover-up.

And needless to say, during this time—and we now know this for a fact—the CIA was in the front-line (although largely operating behind the scenes)—along with the FBI—in doing a great deal of mischief designed to confuse research into the JFK assassination.

And, I think, it's also fair to say that the Mossad's own fine hand—through its assets in the mainstream media, in particular—also played a major part in providing vital support to the intrigues of the CIA and the FBI in this regard.

Essentially the same scenario came in the wake of the Oklahoma City bombing. This time, with the rise of desktop publishing and desktop video production, those who were dissenting against the official version of events had, in some respects, even greater outreach than the JFK researchers who were giving headaches to those responsible for the official cover-up.

And the advent of the Internet—though, as we said, still in its earliest days of development—added another dimension that gave considerable outreach to the critics of the government's lies surrounding the Oklahoma tragedy.

But by the time of the 9-11 disaster, the Internet was already holding sway, and it proved to be a valuable asset in so many ways for those who were seeking to research the story behind the story of 9-11 and to communicate their findings to the American people and to the world.

As a direct consequence, the powers-that-be—whomever you choose to identify as such—realized that the Internet could prove to be a very real danger to their continuing domination of the mass print and broadcast media in the United States and around the globe.

As such, the powers-that-be realized they simply had to find ways to be able to circumvent the growing truth movement—a veritable tsunami that was piling up and preparing to swamp the conspirators and the lies about 9-11 purveyed upon the American people.

In addition to this, another (very negative) aspect of the Internet must be considered.

While the Internet has indeed been a major venue for truth—about 9-11 and so many other matters—the Internet has also set the stage for a growing amount of disinformation (both deliberate and unintentional) that has had the effect of negating the very good research on 9-11 and other issues that has been achieved by sincere truth-seekers.

Ironically, in this regard, the aforementioned Zionist propagandist, Jonathan Kay, has summarized the matter well:

Elaborate conspiracy theories now can be cobbled together literally overnight through the efforts of hundreds of scattered dilettante conspiracists.

Another result is that conspiracists all around the world now tend to focus on the same few dozen talking points that figure prominently on the top websites.

While Kay doesn't say it (and he is essentially *celebrating* this point) the truth is that what Kay calls, in this regard, the "intellectual balkanization," that has resulted means that if some bad information—that is, disinformation (deliberate or otherwise)—has been inserted into the debate, that disinformation manages to become an article of faith.

And the result is that serious, fact-focused researchers—those who pay strict attention to detail and try to correct the mistakes—often end up being accused of being the disinformation specialists when, in fact, they are the real truth seekers trying to discredit the disinformation!

Kay assesses the situation in all-too-accurate terms:

The Internet has produced a radical democratization of the conspiracist marketplace of ideas.

No longer does one have to spend years researching and writing a book to attract attention: One can simply set up a blog, or chime in on someone else's, with some refinement of the existing collective lore.

In fact, today's conspiracists don't even have to *read* books—they can pick up all their talking points from Truther websites, or, better yet, from Truther propaganda videos.

And the problem is, as we've said, that these websites and videos that Kay refers to sarcastically as the work of those whom he dismisses as "Truther" sources are not always—in fact, often are not—very reliable sources at all, either as a consequence of slipshod research or simply the result of just bad writing that conveys false ideas as fact.

What has happened is that—just as Kay has said—many people have been propelled into what Kay calls "paranoid echo chambers," in which people repeat back to one another—via email, via websites, in books and articles based on that material—an array of misinformation and disinformation that adds nothing to serious conspiracy inquiry and certainly does it a disservice (which is something that Kay and others of similar mindset certainly like to see happening).

Again, Kay is all-too-unfortunately on the mark when he writes:

The conspiracist's network of enablers grows—often to such a point that it crowds out the conspiracy theorist's nonbelieving friends. The process resembles the formation of an electronic cocoon that envelops a conspiracist with codependents. Surrounded by an enabling group of the like-minded, he gradually embraces the delusion that his movement has gained critical mass

The consequence is that Kay is absolutely correct when he refers to the “dumbing down effect” that is arising as a result of the growing world of Internet conspiracy dabbling and he is very much again on target—all too much so—when he suggests that modern-day conspiracy theorizing is something that many people “fit in between video gaming and Facebook.”

In other words, what Kay calls “conspiracism” is emerging, in many respects, as simply a hobby, a new form of entertainment!

Many people—and these are good people—just don’t realize that the world of conspiracy research is not some game, but a deadly serious realm that intersects with the very real world of high-level conspiracies shaping the course of our future.

So the bottom line truth is that while the Internet has been a valuable tool for genuine truth-seekers, the Internet—by its very nature—has also become (particularly in the wake of 9-11) as a considerable and important resource in the dangerous high-tech arsenal of those who seek to manipulate and misinform the public, most especially those who rely on the Internet as a source of information about the very conspiracies that the real conspirators are engaged in.

The 9-11 experience, so to speak, thus proved to be a very real lesson for those responsible for 9-11 and its cover-up, for they were able to observe (and quite carefully) the manner in which information relating to 9-11 emerged and then circulated via email and other means of Internet communication, including YouTube and other new formats known as “social media.”

And, for the record, it has long been an article of faith—and a reasonable one—that in actual preparation for the orchestration of 9-11, the conspirators had already set in place more than a handful of individuals, websites and other means charged with the evil task of “infiltrating” and manipulating and distorting legitimate efforts to uncover the real truth about 9-11.

In fact, after 9-11, there emerged more than a few people who might be called “instant internet celebrities” who became known as “9-11 truthers” but who were—from the beginning—bought-and-paid-for assets of the high-level forces responsible for 9-11 in the first place.

An entire book could be written about some of these characters, but that’s another matter for another time. But suffice it to say, they made their influence felt (in one way or another) and had a considerable impact in shaping not only the 9-11 truth movement itself, but also by offering up opinions about other matters (various and sundry) that also had the effect of delegitimizing very real research (some of it based on years of study) that countered the intrigues of the global elite.

Many of these operatives spent much of their time putting out what could only be described as downright “crazy” theories about 9-11 that redirected attention away from sober, responsible research.

In other instances, they specialized in cranking out often-reckless theories that were quite easily refutable, therefore giving credence to the oft-heard claim from the mainstream media that any and all other dissident 9-11 research was just as silly and unreliable.

And in a number of instances, there were several 9-11 “truthers” who, while pointing the finger of blame at Israel, were (at the same time) engaging in other activity that led many observers to believe that these individuals were “black propaganda” operatives trying to bring discredit to those who believed Israel was indeed responsible for 9-11.

Two such individuals, Christopher Bollyn and Eric Hufschmid—whom many believe were “ringers” inserted into the 9-11 truth movement from the beginning—ingratiated themselves with *American Free Press* (having pretended to be enthusiastic about my book *Final Judgment*) and, over a period of time, engaged in a concerted effort to influence AFP’s coverage of 9-11—and not in a positive way.

Ultimately AFP discovered that while Bollyn and Hufschmid supplied a lot of “good” information, that data was mixed in with a variety of “bad” data, the consequence of which was that many of the stories the two generated (working hand-in-hand on a daily basis behind the scenes for well over a year) proved to be of rather dubious value.

At one juncture, Bollyn and Hufschmid tried to convince the editors of AFP that outspoken 9-11 survivor, William Rodriguez—who had been honored by 9-11 truth seekers all over the United States and around the world for his integrity—was some sort of “Zionist agent.”

And despite the fact that independently wealthy American philanthropist Jimmy Walter had bankrolled speaking engagements by both Bollyn and Hufschmid, the dynamic duo also spread the word that Walter—who spent millions of dollars of his own money seeking to alert the public to 9-11 truth—was also a stooge for Israeli interests.

For my own part, I spent an entire week in Malaysia in the company of both Rodriguez and Walter and I never saw any sign that they were working to advance Zionist interests in any way, shape or form. However, considering the record of Bollyn and Hufschmid, I think it’s safe to say that *the same thing cannot be said about them*.

Considering all of this, more than a handful of 9-11 dissidents (including many who believed Israel was behind 9-11) ultimately came to conclude Bollyn was actually a disinformation agent using a perverse back-handed way of discrediting AFP and those who believed the Mossad was responsible for 9-11.

Bolyn's critics correctly pointed out that Bolyn had a pattern of misquoting sources, misinterpreting scientific information, and making assertions about certain matters without any foundational authority.

The consequence was that Bolyn's disinformation gave ammunition to critics of AFP's contention that the Mossad was behind 9-11 and as such was enthusiastically bandied about by Zionist propagandists seeking to undermine AFP's thesis even though the questionable material by Bolyn focused on *scientific data that had nothing whatsoever to do with the specific matter of Mossad involvement in 9-11*.

In the end, after their deception was unmasked, Bolyn and Hufschmid launched a smear campaign against AFP alleging that we were, too, were really "Zionist agents" trying to cover up Mossad involvement in 9-11, an allegation preposterous on its face to anyone familiar with AFP's work. Bolyn even claimed that Mark Lane—the *anti-Zionist* Jewish critic of Israel who pinpointed the CIA's role in the JFK assassination conspiracy—was a Zionist and a secret asset of the CIA!

Unfortunately—and not unpredictably—a few naive folks actually believed these liars, especially people new to the 9-11 truth movement who didn't have access to the big picture. However, when all was said and done, the romance between Bolyn and Hufschmid came to a bitter end and the two began accusing one another of being Zionist agents!

And the strange outside possibility was that both of them could actually have been right. After all, not all Zionist agents necessarily know the identities of the others. That's how complex the world of intelligence intrigue happens to be.

Hufschmid's own website devolved into a mish-mash of weird commentary (often referencing sexual matters, especially human interaction with animals) and once even included a nude photograph of Hufschmid, taken from the rear, ostensibly for the purpose of explaining some "health" matter Hufschmid felt would interest his readers.

That Bolyn, an American, had spent time on an Israeli kibbutz and later married an Israeli woman—who worked for Shin Bet, Israel's domestic intelligence agency—was a point many found telling. That his own sister was also married to a Jew and had taken up residence in Israel was also considered somewhat suspicious.

It's always been my suspicion (based on a variety of data too complicated to delve into here) that Bolyn was a long-standing international free-lance intelligence operative who, for at least a substantial part of his career, was working for the Church of England, which—although many people don't realize it—has always been an arm of British intelligence, active in global intrigue. In fact, Bolyn and his family have multiple "British" connections which also point toward that conclusion.

And, needless to say, the British Empire—which has long been under the control of the Rothschild Dynasty—has always played a peculiar role in advancing Jewish and Zionist interests, even going back to the days when the woman whom Bollyn claims as an ancestor, Anne Boleyn, was a central player in a grand design that disrupted the traditional role of the Roman Catholic Church in Britain and set the stage for the rise of Jewish financial power in Britain in years to come. (And that is a story in and of itself—worthy of a book that has yet to be written.)

But for those who are interested, an English patriot and critic of the New World order with an abiding interest in 9-11 truth—and who does believe Israel was a key player in that tragedy—has put together a remarkably detailed website (complete with a fascinating variety of links and other valuable information) which delves into the bizarre story of Bollyn and his erstwhile friend Hufschmid. See <http://www.takeourworldback.com> for more.

In any event, all of this having been said, it's quite clear that the circumstances surrounding 9-11 gave Israel—along with other power players on the world stage—a new understanding of how the Internet worked and how its resources could be utilized (for better or for worse) in manipulating global opinion.

And as a consequence, people in high places began working to lay forth a plan to ensure that, in the future, the Internet could be used for their own benefit and to undercut those—such as the 9-11 dissidents and other truth-seekers who questioned “official” stories about such matters as the JFK assassination and the Oklahoma bombing and other matters—who stood in opposition to the New World Order agenda.

As we shall see, this carefully-crafted endeavor had even further consequences when the plan was skillfully put into actual working order in the wake of the Sandy Hook shooting in Newtown, Connecticut and the Boston Marathon bombing that followed not long afterward.

The Internet, as a consequence, was no longer simply a venue for truth seekers to “get the word out” about high-level cover-ups. Instead, it became a vehicle used by the high-level conspirators to not only confuse the work of the truth seekers but also to combat them by discrediting them through some of the most manipulative means possible.

It's a story that has never been told before, but it is a story that must be told, if real truth seekers are going to be able to deal with the big challenges that lie ahead, particularly when confronted with propaganda and disinformation designed to frustrate their efforts to combat the very real forces of Evil that lie behind the New World Order.

Let us then move forward and examine this extraordinary conspiracy in a way that it has never before been dissected. It's a shocker . . .

CHAPTER TWENTY-NINE . . .

The Crisis Management Conspiracy: The Extraordinary Untold Story of the Orwellian Experiments in False Flag Crowd Psychology Carried Out at Sandy Hook and Boston

This is guaranteed: You are about to be confronted with some harsh realities that may be unlike you've ever encountered in whatever you've heard about what happened at Sandy Hook school on Dec. 14 2012 and at the Boston Marathon on April 15, 2013.

If you will be personally offended by expressions of fact and opinion (based on fact) that may contradict your deepest-felt beliefs regarding Sandy Hook and Boston, then please read no further.

We'll say it right now—and this will certainly astound you: Forget everything—everything—you've heard in *both* the mainstream media and in the “alternative” media about Sandy Hook and Boston.

Then, after you've studied—if you dare—the material we are about to explore, you'll realize *what really happened at Sandy Hook and Boston is something unlike anything—and so very much bigger—than even you might have imagined.*

You'll never look at Sandy Hook and Boston in the same way again. But you will be prepared for whatever *future* “crisis” the high-level conspirators undoubtedly have planned for America.

As such, when that crisis happens, you'll be better able to see through the fog of disinformation that will be once again unleashed—and rest assured that it will be.

In the wake of Sandy Hook and Boston, much was heard in the “alternative” media about “Crisis Actors” who played a part in misdirecting people's attention as to the real facts about what happened during those “false flag” events.

And false flag events they were.

Both of those tragedies were classic false flag operations, but the truth is that they were not precisely the kind of false flag of the type that we saw carried out in the JFK assassination, in the Oklahoma City bombing, and later in 9-11.

In fact, as we'll see here—and this is the first time ever the story has been told in its entirety—*the real “Crisis Actors” were not those whom many people believed them to be.*

And that is a story in and of itself.

And it will surprise you.

The story is much bigger than anyone might have conceived and it points toward the venal nature of a carefully-crafted high-level conspiracy that bears all the ear-marks of the manipulative masters of mind con-

trol whose not-so-fine (and ugly) hand was so clearly on the levels of power in the murder of JFK and those mass murders that followed in Oklahoma City and with the 9-11 terrorist tragedy.

The vast flow of dissident information that erupted following the events of 9-11 made it an absolute “must” for the Mossad and its allies in intrigue to prevent it from ever happening again.

You see, this is old-fashioned “crisis management” at its best (or worst). But the “crisis” in question—as you might naturally think—is not the death of the president or the lives lost in Oklahoma City or on 9-11.

Rather, the crisis—in the minds of the conspirators responsible—is the potential danger to their power that could erupt if enough people came, for example, to conclude that the Mossad was indeed responsible for any of these false flag terrorist attacks on American soil.

Therefore—in the wake of 9-11 and the Internet frenzy that took place with the rise of fast-moving and widely-distributed conspiracy theories (many implicating the Mossad)—it is now clear a conscious decision was made to ensure that, in the future, when any event of a conspiratorial nature occurred (particularly one involving the Mossad) that those most inclined toward acceptance of conspiracy theories would be corralled and misdirected through the most effective means possible.

However, to achieve this end, it would be necessary to determine the best way to chart the rise and course of conspiracy theories; to pinpoint precisely who is most susceptible toward believing in them and, naturally, to do all that could be done to discredit them.

But the plan—as we shall see—was not just simply standing back and loudly and repeatedly denying the existence of conspiracies. Instead, the course of action was far more subtle—some might even say Talmudic (and, if truth be told, it was a stroke of genius).

The intriguers effectively determined that “if you can’t lick ‘em, join ‘em” (as the old saying goes).

That is, rather than working to REFUTE conspiracy theories, the solution would be to INFECT them and MISDIRECT them and add utter confusion to the mix.

The consequence would be that conspiracy theories would look so ridiculous that no broad swath of people in the general public might one day actually begin to have any belief in their credibility.

In the past, people did have doubts about the official stories relating to the JFK assassination, the Oklahoma City bombing and the 9-11 tragedy. Now, however, emerging alternative theories about other events would be totally eviscerated—from within—and die by their own accord. Anyone putting forth any form of conspiracy theory would automatically become suspect, their very sanity questioned.

The multiple stream of Internet provocations that captured the imagination of the “patriot” and “alternative” media following the Sandy Hook affair and the events in Boston were—beyond any question—the work of high-level conspirators whose designs were clear:

- 1) To monitor the reaction of known (and potential) political dissidents to public events of a “crisis” nature;
- 2) To gauge the level of conspiracy theorizing (and the acceptance of the theories) following such events;
- 3) To trace the origins of conspiracy theories and to chart their course via Internet websites, email and other social media venues;
- 4) To disrupt and misdirect conspiracy theorists and conspiracy theories whose views were deemed in some way problematic; and
- 5) To have in place a fully-functioning Crisis Management System—a very real “conspiracy”—that could be utilized to its fullest capacity at some future time.

The first public hint of what was *openly-acknowledged* high-level intrigue of this sort—designed to undermine the 9-11 truth movement (not to mention any and all suggestions of conspiracies in other realms) was formally unveiled on January 15, 2008.

At that time, one Cass Sunstein, a professor at the University of Chicago, and his co-author, Harvard law professor Adrian Vermeule, put forth a so-called “preliminary draft” of what was officially issued as “Harvard Public Law Working Paper No. 08-03 and University of Chicago Public Law Working Paper No. 199.”

Although little-noticed at the time it was first issued, the “working paper” came under broad-ranging public inspection (widely discussed on the Internet) after Sunstein was drafted in 2009 by President Barack Obama to serve as administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, a post Sunstein departed in 2012.

Later published under other auspices under the title “Conspiracy Theories,” the paper addressed the specific question of how the government should respond to conspiracy theories that were now holding wide sway (particularly on the Internet) and, in no uncertain terms, addressed what Sunstein (who is Jewish) considered the specific danger of the growing belief that Israel had played a part in 9-11.

Naturally, 9-11 truthers were outraged by this paper and noted (rightly so) that the co-author was now effectively “minister of information” for the Obama regime: A U.S. government official was actually pondering, in writing, how government power could be used to deal with conspiracy theories and those who believed in them!

Sunstein’s insidious and Orwellian “think piece” began by raising this question:

Should governmental responses be addressed to the suppliers [of conspiracy theories] with a view to persuading or silencing them, or rather be addressed to the mass audience, with a view to inoculating them from pernicious theories?

While noting that, in his view, “these two strategies are not mutually exclusive,” Sunstein went on to suggest that “perhaps the best approach is to straddle the two audiences with a single response or simply to provide multiple responses.”

However, Sunstein said, many officials considered it “an exercise in futility” to try to respond directly to “the suppliers of conspiracy theories” and that, instead, they tried to “address their responses to the third-party mass audience, hoping to stem the spread of conspiracy theories by dampening the demand rather than by reducing the supply.”

In answer to his own question “What can the government do about conspiracy theories?” Sunstein provided five possibilities:

- (1) Government might ban “conspiracy theories,” somehow defined.
- (2) Government might impose some kind of tax, financial or otherwise, on those who disseminate such theories.
- (3) Government might itself engage in counterspeech, marshaling arguments to discredit conspiracy theories.
- (4) Government might formally hire credible private parties to engage in counterspeech.
- (5) Government might engage in informal communication with such parties, encouraging them to help.

Noting that each of these proposals had “a distinct set of potential effects, or costs and benefits, and each [of which] will have a place under imaginable conditions,” Sunstein answered the specific question of “What should government do?” by stating quite directly:

Our main policy claim here is that government should engage in cognitive infiltration of the groups that produce conspiracy theories, which involves a mix of [the aforementioned proposals:] (3), (4), and (5).

Clearly, Sunstein recognized that—at least under the First Amendment as it exists today—the government could not ban conspiracy theories outright or levy some sort of tax on those who purvey such theories that he and others find offensive.

However, Sunstein concluded, the government could engage in efforts to counter the theories by recruiting “credible private parties” to combat conspiracy theorists and by engaging in “information communication with such parties, encouraging them to help.”

And this framework, in itself, is already in place. It is a very dirty and ugly history indeed, demonstrated by the long-standing collaboration between such groups as the Anti-Defamation League and the Southern Poverty Law Center (not to mention the American Jewish Congress and the American Jewish Committee) working with the CIA and the FBI and other law enforcement agencies, as well as Israel’s Mossad—and, dare we add, British intelligence—in concerted efforts to undermine American political dissidents.

Working from this standpoint Sunstein outlined what he called “a distinctive tactic for breaking up the hard core of extremists who supply conspiracy theories.” This program, he said, involved the following:

[C]ognitive infiltration of extremist groups, whereby government agents or their allies (acting either virtually or in real space, and either openly or anonymously) will undermine the crippled epistemology of believers by planting doubts about the theories and stylized facts that circulate within such groups, thereby introducing beneficial cognitive diversity.

Because, Sunstein said, “conspiracy theorists are likely to approach evidence and arguments in a biased way, they are not likely to respond well, or even logically, to the claims of [people they know to be] public officials,” it was vital that, as Sunstein said, “government officials would participate anonymously or even with false identities” in 9-11 discussion groups and other conspiracy-focused gatherings on the Internet and elsewhere.

And with the increasingly widespread knowledge we now have about the capacity of the National Security Agency—among many government intelligence agencies in the United States alone—to monitor the telephone calls, emails, and other Internet activity of all Americans, we can certainly say, with utmost authority, that Sunstein and his co-conspirators and like-minded intriguers had already concluded that the framework was in place to be able to see precisely who was engaged in conspiracy talk and with whom they were communicating.

It is thus no coincidence that when the series of scandals erupted over the summer of 2013 regarding the activities of the National Security Agency (NSA) that Cass Sunstein was one of the four members of the so-called “independent” panel appointed by President Barack

Obama charged with the responsibility of “reviewing” the operations of the NSA and other government agencies.

And nor, we might add, it is any coincidence that another member of the panel, Richard Clarke (a former high ranking advisor to presidents—Democratic and Republican alike—in the realm of “national security”) now happens to head a private firm known as Good Harbor Security Risk Management.

And yes, as you might have guessed, Good Harbor touts “Crisis Management” as one of its specialties.

Crisis Management—that’s what it’s all about.

The concept of “Crisis Management” is the new “big thing” in our modern era. And don’t forget—as we mentioned in Chapter Eighteen—that former high-ranking FBI official Neil Herman who was involved in much of the intrigues surrounding 9-11 (and who later worked as director of “fact-finding” for Israel’s American intelligence arm, the Anti-Defamation League) went on to become part of the “crisis management team” at Burson-Marsteller, one of the premier firms in that field today.

In fact, two popular television dramas of recent date have Crisis Management specialists at the core of their storyline—“Scandal,” portraying the day-to-day workings of a beautiful African-American Crisis Management operative in Washington, D.C. and “The Good Wife,” featuring a particularly wily Crisis Management specialist (portrayed as a distinctly Jewish figure with the name of “Eli Gold”) who carries on his intrigues in Cass Sunstein’s home base of Chicago, no less.

Both programs are quite revealing and say much about the nature of Crisis Management methods of operation.

Several episodes of “The Good Wife” noted the use of “cyber skills” whose duty it is to infiltrate the Internet and place false stories and provocations designed to promote some particular agenda—or disrupt someone else’s.

A simple Internet search of the term “Crisis Management”—and the term does deserve to be capitalized as we have rendered it here—demonstrates how foremost these new techniques of “public relations” (that is, propaganda) really are in the minds of those in high places.

As we said: “Crisis Management—that’s what it’s all about.”

So it was that—with the nature of Internet communication as it exists today and with the capacity to be able to monitor any and all content circulating on the Internet—Cass Sunstein and company had the means to construct and carry out a rather simple (but 21st Century-style technologically-sophisticated) exercise in Crisis Management planning which incorporated rather skillful experimentation with that new technology in implementing good old-fashioned Crowd Control.

And when we talk about Crowd Control, we're not talking about the use of fire hoses and police dogs and stun guns. Rather, in fact, what we're talking about is really just a highly-advanced form of "Mind Control"—one designed to influence a large number of people over an extended period of time through covert and quite insidious manipulation of the media—and that does include the Internet and the "alternative" and "independent" media as well.

Unfortunately, a brief digression into the topic of Mind Control is relevant and important here, for it relates directly to the nature of the manipulative experiments in False Flag Crowd Control that were central to the Internet frenzy following both Sandy Hook and Boston.

Long part of the intrigues of the high-level conspirators—best exemplified in the CIA's infamous MK-ULTRA experiments in Mind Control, the initial stages of which were launched in the days following the CIA's founding in 1947—this realm has not only been a province of the CIA, but also that of the Soviet KGB and Israel's Mossad and other intelligence agencies (both public and private)—as well.

Now, unfortunately, although the concept of Mind Control is best known among truth-seekers as a consequence of the widespread distribution of such works as Cathy O'Brien's rather dubious book *Trance-Formation of America*, the truth is that there has always been available a wide variety of responsible material on the subject, in particular the book by former State Department foreign service officer John D. Marks entitled *The Search for the Manchurian Candidate*.

Subtitled "The CIA and Mind Control: The Story of the Agency's Secret Efforts to Control Human Behavior," Marks' book was based on some 16,000 pages of documents that Marks pried out of the CIA through the Freedom of Information Act following the public revelations regarding CIA adventures in this bizarre field that were unveiled in the wake of a controversial series of Senate hearings conducted by Sen. Frank Church (D-Idaho) into the activities of the CIA. Until then, Americans believed that only "the Communists" and "the Nazis" had engaged in unpleasant experiments to manipulate human behavior.

(The title of Marks' non-fiction book was inspired by the 1958 novel by Richard Condon—later a popular motion picture—entitled *The Manchurian Candidate*. In that horrifying story, an American soldier is brainwashed by the communists during the Korean War, falsely set up as a "war hero" to be revered by the American public, and later manipulated in an assassination plot upon his return to the United States.

(It turns out that the hero's own mother is actually a secret communist agent—despite the fact that she is one of the best known "anti-communists" in America—and is using her son as part of a communist

plot to seize control of the United States in the guise of fighting communism. The mind-control victim never knows he is being manipulated—until it is too late.)

So—all of that having been said—Mind Control is very real and can be carried out in a variety of ways. And Crowd Control—which is a part of Crisis Management—is a form of Mind Control. And you may rest assured that those who have an interest in these matters have studied these concepts carefully and know *precisely* how they work.

And—as we have seen—with high-level forces having witnessed the growth of “conspiracy theories” which these would-be masters of the universe realize endanger their power—particularly with the rise of the Internet as a somewhat “independent” means of communication—the need to combat those conspiracy theories (and to control the Internet) has become a major concern.

These very real conspirators—people of the likes of the aforementioned Cass Sunstein, who actually laid out a plan for undermining conspiracy theories—determined the best way to facilitate their operation was to orchestrate (or take advantage of) an event that would grip the public imagination and then manipulate it for their own purposes.

Their goal was to have in place a carefully-structured network that, in the future, could be used in a much-bigger fashion to direct or—as the case may be—to misdirect public opinion (particularly in the realm of those open to “conspiracy theories”) and ensure that the trade of information regarding such events was carefully controlled.

Here, essentially, was the plan:

These conspirators needed a “crisis”—a reasonably small and manageable event they could monitor and manipulate from the very beginning, finding out, essentially, “who’s in touch with whom” and by what means and venues conspiracy theories (relating to such a crisis) gained their most widespread circulation.

Whether the crisis was “real”—that is, of its own making, one that happened on its own—or whether it was manufactured (through covert means by some clandestine agency) didn’t matter. What mattered was the capacity to track (and, more importantly, *to direct*) public reaction to the crisis (particularly in the realm of “conspiracy theories”) and to manage the crisis to such a degree that any and all conspiracy theories relating to that crisis could be made to look foolish.

And here’s the critical point to remember: These conspirators also realized that they could effectively redirect public debate not just by countering conspiracy theories but by *actively inserting their own downright silly and ridiculous disinformation into the debate with the aim of discrediting any and all conspiracy theories.*

Worthy of the greatest thinkers of the Talmud, it was right out of the legendary Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion. And it was programmed—from the start—to capture the imagination of (and control) the minds of sincere patriots who were already inclined (quite naturally) to buy into conspiracy theories!

Fully versed in the legendary sociological study of crowd behavior laid down in 1895 by Gustave Lebon in *The Crowd*—a volume described as having “exerted a powerful influence upon the thought of men aiming to understand the workings of collective behavior and of social psychology”—Sunstein and company set in motion a scheme that can only be described as brilliant, if not just simply as evil.

To those who understand Sunstein’s proposition on the deeper level of Mind Control that it represents and who have likewise taken the time to carefully study the bigger picture in retrospect, it is all too apparent that the Internet-based frenzy following the Sandy Hook affair was clearly the work of the Sunstein crowd—we’ll call them the Crisis Management Conspirators—who remembered all too well what Gustave LeBon had said when he wrote so succinctly: “To know the art of impressing the imagination of crowds is to know at the same time the art of governing them.”

The Sandy Hook affair was tailor-made for putting the Sunstein gang’s experiment in motion. It involved violence. It involved the explosive issue of gun control, inasmuch as the incident was said to have been a mass shooting. And it was another sensational school shooting—and one at a grade school, no less.

The dynamics were absolutely on target—no pun intended—for the Sunstein thesis to be put to the test.

And, quite predictably, the mass media—as a consequence of its typically reckless nature—played right into the scheme. The frenzied rush in the heat of the moment to get “the scoop” led to sloppy, reporting and presumably otherwise honest mistakes by journalists.

And naturally, a lot of these errors were quickly the subject of discussion among emailers and those participating on Internet discussion forums who were concerned about the obvious push for further gun control that was accompanying the media reportage relating to the events at Sandy Hook.

Now some of the errors were eventually corrected, but many of the errors were simply ignored or otherwise lost in the shuffle, and this led to further suspicions on the part of those who sensed that there was more to Sandy Hook than was officially being reported.

(Unfortunately, although some of the errors were indeed later corrected, many so-called “conspiracy theorists” never became aware of

those corrections and continued—even to this day—to cite those “errors” as evidence of a cover-up.

(And that’s another reason conspiracy theorists *must* be detail-oriented, for if they can be disproven in one minor area, those who are eager to dismiss their theories will use that *one* mistake as “evidence” that the bigger picture—the more broad-ranging so-called “conspiracy theory”—is, in and of itself, *totally* wrong.)

But note this:

Considering the fact Sunstein and his like-minded conspirators do have high-level connections to the controllers of the big media, it’s likely some media elements *deliberately* purveyed incomplete or imprecise stories about Sandy Hook, knowing full well that alert readers and audiences would detect these errors and that they would be bandied about as “proof” of a conspiracy, further muddying the waters. And that, in fact, *is* what happened in many instances.

However, as we shall see, there is strong evidence to suggest that at least some “inside” elements in the mass media *did* play a key role in “leaking” material that was used by the Sunstein group to distract truth seekers in the wake of Sandy Hook. More about *that* later.

But aside from the mis-reporting in the major media (whether deliberate or otherwise) it was almost exclusively on the Internet—via the so-called “truther” and “alternative” and “independent” websites, discussion groups, along with email and the popular video forum, YouTube, etc—that a wide variety of absolutely baseless (and largely nonsensical) stories about Sandy Hook began to appear.

This was clearly the work of a small but skilled team of operatives working for Sunstein and company.

As Sunstein had suggested in his now-infamous working paper, their purpose was to manipulate—and ultimately refute—and make fools of—sincere truth seekers and so-called “conspiracy theorists.”

And, even more so, Sunstein’s goal was to convince the broad range of the American public that *anyone* who spoke about *any* conspiracies at high levels was just simply not someone to be believed.

One of the first and most outrageous of these Internet “revelations” that did so much to make sincere truth seekers look foolish was the oft-repeated theme that “Sandy Hook was a hoax” and that no children were even killed there. (Yes, that was a frequently repeated allegation.)

Even the introduction of the word “hoax” was carefully calculated and with the mass media reporting that “conspiracy theorists” were using that term to describe the tragedy, many in the general public began to doubt the sanity of a lot of good people who were rightfully raising questions about what happened at Sandy Hook and the way that

it was being exploited.

And—just as Sunstein and company expected (and desired)—other individuals discussing other matters involving conspiracies (the 9-11 cover-up, the Oklahoma bombing, the JFK assassination, and even the Israeli attack on the *U.S.S. Liberty*) were themselves being subjected to sarcastic comments such as, “I suppose you’re *also* one of those people who doesn’t believe those 20 little children were killed at Sandy Hook.”

Sunstein and company had scored big.

They knew they literally had a proverbial “captive audience” that was unwittingly receptive to their manipulations. And they had the capacity to track—via the Internet—the entirety of the exchange of information going on.

This was their first big “test tube” case and it was proving to be a success, perhaps beyond even their wildest dreams.

Sunstein and the Crisis Management Conspirators implementing his plan recognized that the diverse assortment of groups active in political dissent—whether they call themselves “patriots” or “nationalists” or “truth seekers” or “white separatists” (the list of such largely self-imposed labels could go on and on)—constituted the definition of a “crowd” as laid forth in the aforementioned Gustave LeBon’s rather sinister analysis of the manner in which a “crowd” can be manipulated.

In its ordinary sense the word “crowd” means a gathering of individuals of whatever nationality, profession, or sex, and whatever be the chances that have brought them together.

From the psychological point of view, the expression “crowd” assumes quite a different signification. . . .

The sentiments and ideas of all the persons in the gathering take one and the same direction, and their conscious personality vanishes. A collective mind is formed, doubtless transitory, but presenting very clearly defined characteristics.

The gathering has thus become . . . an organized crowd, or, if the term is considered preferable, a psychological crowd. It forms a single being, and is subjected to the *law of the mental unity of crowds*.

In other words, these proverbial “mad scientists”—these modern-day Crisis Management Conspirators, steeped in the teachings of LeBon—saw that conspiracy theories tended to form (and initially circulate) within a “crowd” of like-minded individuals and that, from that standpoint alone, such a crowd was easily manipulated. It was, after all, the High Priest of Crowd Control, Le Bon himself, who pointed out that:

However indifferent it may be supposed, a crowd, as a rule, is in a state of expectant attention, which renders suggestion easy. The first suggestion formulated which arises implants itself immediately by a process of contagion in the brains of all assembled, and the identical bent of the sentiments of the crowd is immediately an accomplished fact.

That is, once a particular “theory”—some particular thought, some particular “factoid” (as they now call it)—has been inserted into a like-minded crowd, that factoid (even if, per chance, it doesn’t happen to be true) almost becomes an article of faith or even, as Le Bon said, “immediately an accomplished fact.”

As such, the Le Bonian Mind Control masterminds recognized that precisely because a “crowd” tends, thus, to think alike, and accept all precepts that “sound good” or which seem parallel to their particular mindset, that a “crowd” would immediately incorporate by “process of contagion” any idea inserted into the mass thinking of the crowd.

The Crisis Management Conspirators knew that once a “crowd” had become conditioned to “think alike” (so to speak) and was thereby easily subject to the power of suggestion, that such a like-minded group would immediately start to develop its own particular mindset a way of looking at some issue or event.

As Le Bon pointed out:

The simplest event that comes under the observation of a crowd is soon totally transformed.

A crowd thinks in images, and the image itself immediately calls up a series of other images, having no logical connection with the first. We can easily conceive this state by thinking of the fantastic succession of ideas to which we are sometimes led by calling up in our minds any fact.

Our reason shows us the incoherence there is in these images, but a crowd is almost blind to this truth, and confuses with the real event what the deforming action of its imagination has superimposed thereon.

A crowd scarcely distinguishes between the subjective and the objective. It accepts as real the images evoked in its mind, though they most often have only a very distant relation with the observed fact.

Essentially, because so many people in “The Crowd”—that is, the

“truth movement”—saw (quite clearly) that the mass media was attempting to stoke up demands for increased gun control measures (even outright gun confiscation on a national scale), the whole image of Sandy Hook changed in its entirety.

In fact, this was the REAL “false flag” in the whole Sandy Hook debate, but many good patriots didn’t see what was happening.

Rather than focusing on *the genuine issue of specific concern*—the push for gun control—“The Crowd” was instead getting bogged down and looking in the wrong direction, worrying about a variety of unimportant details and making allegations about Sandy Hook—that no children had actually died, for example—that made honest critics of gun control look foolish, if not downright venal.

Most people among the general public more or less accepted the idea that a disturbed young man had committed a horrible deed and that—predictably—gun control advocates once again jumped on the tragedy in order to pursue their anti-gun agenda.

A lot of people—including a lot of people in the “truth movement”—had previously (and rightly) expressed concerns that many of the people involved in previous mass shootings had been under the influence of psychiatric drugs which have been pushed by the major media to the great profit of the pharmaceutical conglomerates.

And at the outset, even most skeptics of the official version of events had no doubt buying the possibility that the alleged shooter, Adam Lanza, had been the victim of MK-ULTRA style mind control, brain-washed into committing a mass shooting in order to help stampede public support for gun control or outright gun confiscation.

Over the years more than a few independent journalists had compiled an assembly of data on a number of mass shootings in the U.S. and elsewhere suggesting there was much more to the story behind these shootings; that, in fact, they were orchestrated by behind-the-scenes forces and that there was evidence of “mind control” involved.

So there were *a lot of good reasons* for many to at least suspect that perhaps there was some sort of Mind Control or other form of high-level intrigue involved in the Sandy Hook shooting.

In fact—up until Sandy Hook—this explanation (that Lanza was a mind-controlled false flag patsy who actually killed little children) would have sufficed for even the most hard-core skeptic who doubted the official version of events laid down by the authorities.

But with Sandy Hook—and the intervention of the Crisis Management Conspirators—the outlook of the “average” grass-roots conspiracy theorist in “The Crowd” would never be the same again.

As a consequence of the intrigues of the Crisis Management

Conspirators, the mindset of the conspiracy theorists would be drastically altered to the point that many good people were pushed into the direction of believing that absolutely nothing—absolutely nothing—could ever be believed and that everything—absolutely everything—was a horrendous lie.

And we are not talking just about Sandy Hook. We are talking about virtually anything—everything—taking place in our world today.

The Crisis Management Conspirators were pushing honest truth seekers in “The Crowd” into a proverbial padded cell where they could just keep screaming at the top of their voices and banging their heads against the wall with the ultimate realization that nobody was paying any attention to them whatsoever—a virtual Twilight Zone.

Nonetheless—on a parallel basis—the Crisis Management Conspirators, quite naturally, didn’t want anyone in the general public, at least, to ever consider the possibility that there had been any Mind Manipulation or any conspiracy to stage a “crisis”—such as another mass shooting—to justify gun confiscation.

Therefore, they began spinning bizarre tales and inserting them onto the Internet and into the mind of “The Crowd”—that is, patriots and other skeptics of the official story—in order to muddy up serious inquiry and discussion.

They dazzled “The Crowd” with an array of colorful and interesting and fiendishly clever (if not obviously outrageous) rumors that absolutely had the immediate and profound (and very much intended) effect of directing public ire upon those good patriots—the so-called “conspiracy theorists”—who were rightly concerned about behind-the-scenes manipulation that accompanied the events at Sandy Hook.

Soon enough—and not surprisingly—people in the general public began to think *any* conspiracy theories about Sandy Hook were absolutely beyond the pale and that people inclined toward conspiracy theories questioning the official government line were crazy troublemakers who belonged in mental hospitals!

The Crisis Management Conspirators mesmerized and manipulated American patriots and other skeptics via a non-stop wave of Sandy Hook “factoids” that quickly spread like wildfire across the Internet. And patriot websites by the hundreds—by the thousands—were picking them up and reporting them. These legends—spawned by the Crisis Management folks—became the staple daily diet of email addicts who were eagerly helping distribute the latest Sandy Hook “revelations.”

And, of course, this—as we shall see in a moment—was all keeping in line with another aspect of the “crowd” that the “guru” of the Crisis Management Conspirators—Gustave LeBon—had already assessed.

People were falling victim to the the fact that because something is repeated time and again, it gains a certain credibility in the mind of the ‘crowd.’ LeBon wrote:

The influence of repetition on crowds is comprehensible when the power is seen which it exercises on the most enlightened minds.

This power is due to the fact that the repeated statement is embedded in the long run in those profound regions of our unconscious selves in which the motives of our actions are forged.

At the end of a certain time we have forgotten who is the author of the repeated assertion, and we finish by believing it.

When an affirmation has been sufficiently repeated and there is unanimity in this repetition . . . what is called a current of opinion is formed and the powerful mechanism of contagion intervenes.

Precisely because so much disinformation was being repeated by well-meaning and entirely innocent folks, a lot of good patriots concluded that something had to be amiss with the “official” Sandy Hook story or otherwise—they said—so many good patriots on so many websites and elsewhere wouldn’t be raising these questions.

However—and this is a point that many failed to consider at the time (but which many patriots are now coming to realize):

The truth is that a vast majority of the Sandy Hook spin came from theretofore unknown sources—who to this day still remain largely unknown, other than through Internet nicknames—who helped put out much of the material in the first place, adding often-dubious commentary that helped stir up suspicion in the first place.

As LeBon had so rightly said, “at the end of a certain time we have forgotten who is the author of the repeated assertion, and we finish by believing it.”

How true it was with Sandy Hook!

These Internet sources who had suddenly popped up had no reputation (either good or bad) among traditional patriots and conspiracy theorists—but *their impact was immeasurable.*

And they were ably aided and abetted by some longtime deep-cover assets—*agents provocateurs*—inside the patriot movement who helped give further “credibility” to these stories being cranked out by the Crisis Management Conspirators.

A lot of old CIA hands and federal informants—veterans of the black

propaganda journal *Media Bypass* (referenced in Chapter Fourteen) that had been heavily funded and set up in time for the disinformation surrounding the Oklahoma City bombing—popped up to help disseminate a lot of the Sandy Hook-related nonsense that gripped the imagination of the patriots.

Meanwhile, on a daily basis, the powers-that-be in control of the mass media were cranking up a continuing round-the-clock campaign in favor of gun control, pointing at Sandy Hook as underscoring the necessity for dismantling the Second Amendment. It was, they said, “for the children.” Americans were told they needed to give up their guns so as to prevent future tragedies of this kind.

But the irony is that many good people who thought that by “exposing the Sandy Hook fraud”—that is, passing on the Internet-based rumors about Sandy Hook—that they were “doing something” to stop the drive for gun control.

In fact, it was a total misdirection from the central issue of gun control. Peoples’ energies were being focused not on gun control but on the “necessity” to “spread the truth about Sandy Hook.” And that, as we’ve said, was the real “false flag” in Sandy Hook. However, unfortunately, the patriots who were repeating the Internet rumors were giving a whole new twist to the controversy surrounding Sandy Hook and the push for gun control that came in its wake.

What was happening was that the more the conspiracy theories surrounding Sandy Hook got all the more fantastic, the more it had the effect of discrediting all sincere critics of gun control who were being identified with “those people who say that no children really died at Sandy Hook.” The bottom line matter of fighting the drive for gun control was sidelined by “The Crowd” which had become caught up in discussing (and perpetuating) all of the silly Sandy Hook rumors that the Crisis Management Conspirators had unleashed on the Internet.

The Crisis Management Conspirators—having a field day (and a good laugh) at their success in re-shaping the thinking of conspiracy-conscious patriots—knew full well of another key concept put forth by LeBon: The fact that a “crowd” can accept the most ridiculous propositions, ones that an individual—prior to becoming a member of the “crowd”—would not be so ready to incorporate into his thinking, if given the time to consider the matter more fully.

More and more a fabulously colorful bazaar of bizarre conspiracy theories began to swirl around Sandy Hook. Many of these theories—often promulgated as part of a grab-bag package by their promoters—were directly contradictory.

Here’s an example.

One big name figured out that Israel's Mossad was behind the shooting. His proof? Well, everybody knows that the Mossad is murderous and that Israel has no problem killing children.

This authority claims a three-man Mossad team pulled off the job—but then again, there are folks who say this investigator is dead wrong (pun intended) since, of course, nobody was killed at Sandy Hook at all, or least not enough people killed to justify a big-time Mossad operation of the kind described by that analyst.

However, as far as the Mossad is concerned (vis-a-vis Sandy Hook) there were two different claims in this regard. Some said the Mossad did it to hurt President Obama, getting revenge against the president for not being pro-Israel enough. Others said the Mossad did it to help the president further along the conspiracy to grab America's guns.

In other words, if you think the Mossad did it, you have two entirely different (and quite contradictory) motives to choose from. And so, depending on what you think of Barack Obama, you have two different versions of the story that "The Mossad Was Behind Sandy Hook."

But the foundation of this theory—which is certainly delectable to anyone who has professed belief of Mossad involvement in the JFK assassination, the Oklahoma City bombing and in 9-11—doesn't have any basis in any given *facts*, the exciting scenario itself notwithstanding.

Yet—believe it or not—after I publicly discounted Mossad involvement in Sandy Hook (on the basis that I had seen no *actual proof*—even circumstantial—of such involvement) I was accused of "covering up for the Mossad" and of being "a Zionist agent." (Seriously.)

In fact, there is no proof that Mossad assassins were involved in any shooting (real or staged) in Sandy Hook.

How the Mossad *was* involved in Sandy Hook was in a way most of the great conspiracy theorists clearly were unable to figure out, so busy they were with distributing the increasingly more silly and unlikely conspiracy theories that were running wild on the Internet.

The Mossad was hiding in plain sight and the patriot researchers and conspiracy theorists never saw it at all.

It was clearly allies (or outright assets) of the Mossad—figures in Cass Sunstein's Crisis Management gang—who were conjuring up and distributing the ridiculous stories that gained such currency. In effect, the patriots were passing on Mossad-sponsored black propaganda and they never understood that at all!

And, naturally, this had the desired effect of making any and all conspiracy theorists—especially anyone who might dare mention the dread word "Mossad"—look crazy, marginal and generally to be disbelieved.

So, in that sense, the Mossad *was* behind Sandy Hook but not in the

way that many Sandy Hook true believers might like to think. At the very least, the Mossad profited from Sandy Hook by being able to monitor (and manipulate) the conspiracy theories that emerged. It was a classic experiment in Crisis Management and Mind Control and the patriot dissidents never understood that at all.

And that's precisely why the bad folks at the Mossad and their allies among the Crisis Management Conspirators had a good laugh at the antics of the "patriots" who were hawking the latest disinformation inserted onto the Internet designed to make those patriots look foolish.

But despite the contradictions in this realm (and in other aspects of the stories circulating about Sandy Hook) that didn't seem to phase many who helped spread the stories saying, "I'm just passing on what I've heard." These people actually believed that as a member of "The Crowd" they were doing their patriotic duty, having no idea they were being manipulated by the very forces they were seeking to combat!

The Crisis Management Conspirators had once again put the theoretical precepts of their High Priest—LeBon—into practice by conjuring up (and putting into distribution via the Internet) the most audaciously ridiculous narratives. They knew full well that "The Crowd" would buy into these stories without question. As LeBon wrote:

The figurative imagination of crowds is very powerful, very active and very susceptible of being keenly impressed. The images evoked in their mind by a personage, an event, an accident, are almost as lifelike as the reality.

Crowds are to some extent in the position of the sleeper whose reason, suspended for the time being, allows the arousing in his mind of images of extreme intensity which would quickly be dissipated could they be submitted to the action of reflection.

Crowds, being incapable both of reflection and of reasoning, are devoid of the notion of improbability; and it is to be noted that in a general way it is the most improbable things that are the most striking.

This is why it happens that it is always the marvellous and legendary side of events that more specially strike crowds.

Clearly, this phenomenon explains why so many otherwise sensible people began to believe some of the most extraordinary claims about Sandy Hook set loose on the Internet by *theretofore unknown "sources" with no record of recognition or credibility in any way, shape or form.*

Because so much of this material was being so quickly and so

widely distributed and then being re-distributed by others eager for new information about Sandy Hook, these improbable and ridiculous notions effectively became a matter of fact. And, as LeBon said, the “marvellous”—that is, the most striking, even outrageous—aspects of the Sandy Hook theories were what took hold.

Before long, it was being said that accused Sandy Hook shooter Adam Lanza hadn't even fired a single shot that day. According to the story, he had never even been in the school that day—not alive, at least. The story was that Lanza had been formally declared dead by the Social Security administration one day before the shooting—and that he died in New Hampshire (a state away). The real conspirators behind Sandy Hook had not only killed Lanza the day before, but—evidently following the law (!)—they had made certain to register his death with the Social Security administration, law-abiding folks that these conspirators were.

When some “theorists” were pressed on this point, they could only respond, “Oh, well, they wanted us to discover that. This was their way of confounding us and showing us they could do anything they wanted. They wanted us to see that there really was much more to the story but they also wanted to display their power to cover up the truth.”

Hardly a day had gone by before it was alleged that the police and fire departments were involved in the conspiracy, deliberately blocking the exits to the school during the shooting for the purpose of ensuring that the killers could rack up as high a body count as possible.

The county coroner's public persona rubbed people the wrong way. Somebody pronounced the judgment that he wasn't “acting right” for someone who had just performed autopsies on a bunch of purportedly dead children and therefore he definitely had to be in on the act. He was just “too weird.”

Soon enough, that was the final word on the matter among dissidents. Somebody had said it, so therefore it had to be true.

But the real question is this: WHO first said it and why did THEIR judgment effectively become the last word on the subject—“proof” of a much-bigger conspiracy?

Nobody seemed to know precisely where so much of the “dissident” opinions were coming from—but whatever was said was freely passed on as though it constituted solid proof of “something.”

Because the police initially prevented families from viewing the bullet-ripped corpses of the children, word spread that the families never once saw their dead children at all, despite the fact there were open casket funerals for a number of the children the conspiracy theorists said had never really died.

Wax figures in the coffins, maybe? Designed to fool the parents who

believed that their children had been killed? (Or were the parents, as some said, in on the conspiracy?)

“If they reported that the families couldn’t see the bodies,” demanded those who said they were “just asking questions,” then why, they asked, didn’t the media then report that the families were finally allowed to see the bodies?

In fact, as anyone who has watched any of the standard police procedural dramas that occupy much of television today knows full well, it is *not* police procedure to allow the bodies of crime victims to be immediately inspected by the families. And no, that’s not “just Hollywood.” That’s how it really works.

Ask your local policeman.

In fact, families were later allowed to view the remains of their dead loved ones and in several instances (brought to my attention) there were open caskets for children who had died.

Here’s the story:

In a radio broadcast on Jan. 20, 2013 I had urgently warned truth seekers not to be taken in by all of this emerging nonsense and came under a great deal of criticism from many good folks who were fervent believers in the theory that no children had died and that the stories told by surviving Sandy Hook teachers (and children) were all lies.

However, I was heartened when—during an email exchange between myself and two well-known and respected patriots, Carol Asher, the longtime assistant to famed peace officer Jack McLamb, and Ron Neil of the Dollar DVD Project Liberty (see the website at onedollardvdproject.com)—Ron sent me this email saying: “You surprised me with your attitude about Sandy Hook. I respect your opinion and will be more careful on this subject. You reminded me that we must focus and not get sidetracked.”

(My whole point from the start! But *most* people who had joined the Sandy Hook frenzy couldn’t quite see that, as Ron Neil clearly did.

And—to the heart of the matter—Ron also sent Carol and I a communication from one of his correspondents who was commenting critically on allegations that Sandy Hook teacher Kaitlin Roig was a fraud.

While Roig was being hailed as a heroine for having rescued her students, there were truth seekers who had become convinced by the disinformation from the Crisis Management Conspirators that Roig was an audacious liar. Neil’s correspondent took issue with the claim—circulating on the Internet—that Roig wasn’t even a teacher.

In fact, she wrote: “She [Roig] is my grandson’s teacher and I know that part is factual,” adding a very real warning for truth seekers:

I think that a huge mistake has been made for the alternative media. We are looking like "nuts" . . . especially the people that say that nobody died. My daughter went to several wakes and funerals. And . . . she saw open caskets. Some of her dear friends lost their children!

In the meantime, though, this teacher, Kaitlin Roig, was being called “a possible Israeli Mossad terrorist” and a “false witness” and was subjected to the claim that she was really actress Rebekah Fernandez who was supposedly posing as a fake Sandy Hook teacher—namely Roig!

So although there was very real proof that Roig was a Sandy Hook teacher, there were people who were saying that she was actually a “Crisis Actor”—much more about the Crisis Actor theories later—who was playing a part to help perpetrate a gigantic fraud.

However, one truth seeker—recognizing that there was something wrong with all of this—commented in response to an Internet posting of a video of an interview with Roig that critics “proved” she was a liar, an audacious actress posing as a heroine:

What doesn't make sense to me, too, is that this Kaitlyn Roig is supposed to be a paid actor, yet she is, or was, a teacher at the time of the shooting?

I mean, so let me get this straight: She taught at this school for, how long?

But, suddenly, now that this incident happened, and she's giving this report about what went down in her own classroom, suddenly she's just labeled a "paid actor," because people think she's lying?

And—get this—some of Roig's critics even thought the fact that Roig was married immediately after Sandy Hook was additional proof that she just couldn't be for real. “If she was so affected by the tragedy,” people growled, “how could she dare get married?”

This was the kind of genuinely crazy theorizing (and thinking) that the Crisis Management Conspirators had so effectively conjured up.

(A personal note: My oldest brother and his wife were married on the very day just hours her cousin and two of their childhood friends — who were supposed to attend that wedding—were killed in a tragic explosion. Nobody—absolutely nobody—perceived their decision to proceed with the marriage as being crass or as inappropriate.)

But in the wake of Sandy Hook, it became an article of faith that anyone who seemed to affirm the “official” story in any way was lying. And

it was such an attitude that gripped the minds of truth seekers to the point, as Ron Neil's aforementioned correspondent said, that "We are looking like 'nuts.'"

But truth seekers had become so much a part of "The Crowd" that they couldn't see what was happening and how they were effectively discrediting themselves in the minds of the public.

And then the fact that the police would not release particular details of the shooting was said to be "proof" that there was a cover-up. But, again, the truth is that even a cursory reading of any daily newspaper reporting on the most mundane of events involving a police investigation will reveal—time and time again—that the police just simply do not go about releasing a lot of data while any investigation is going on. That's a fact that can be confirmed by even the most casual reference to any given newspaper in any town or city in the country.

However, under the clever contrivance of the Crisis Management Conspirators, honest truth seekers had become totally distracted, caught up in minutiae that was absolutely irrelevant but which, nonetheless, seemed to possess the patriot movement, as if by magic.

The proverbial "Crowd" had been caught up in a whirlwind of deliberate disinformation. It was as though some people genuinely wanted to believe that nothing—absolutely nothing—was true. That all was a lie. And a lot of cheap hucksters—along with the Crisis Management Conspirators—played on this.

It was even said that the governor of Connecticut had advance knowledge of the impending "event"—we'll call it an event, rather than a shooting, since a lot of people don't think anybody was really shot at Sandy Hook in the first place!

The basis of this rumor was the fact the governor had said publicly that he had been told that such an event could happen.

What the governor was saying—and this was no secret—was that public schools and other venues—public and private, including shopping malls, bus stations, etc—had been training their own personnel in the matter of dealing with such an emergency.

However, the governor's comment—based on something that had been widely reported for months, even years, on end in the mass media (that is, how communities were preparing to deal with such events)—was twisted and presented as a Freudian slip that revealed the governor's foreknowledge of the impending crisis at Sandy Hook.

According to one claim, it was Attorney General Eric Holder (evidently another of the many conspirators) who briefed the governor a full month in advance that there was going to be a phony happening at Sandy Hook to be presented to the public as a "school shooting."

How many other public officials and law enforcement were brought into the loop no one could really say for sure, but then, again, it had already been suggested (as noted earlier) that the local police and fire departments were part of the massacre (or, at least, the cover-up). It seemed like the entire town was involved.

But, then again, there were those who were saying that no massacre had even really happened!

It came down to this: There were some 500 students at Sandy Hook. However, as we've said, some people don't believe there really was a functioning school there at all. And it is said that—of those 500 students—20 of them (along with their families and others) faked their deaths. But some truth seekers—influenced by the disinformation of the Crisis Management Conspirators—now question whether at least some—if not all—of these students ever even existed!

But accepting the idea that 20 students are no longer officially alive (and thus presumably in hiding) that means there are some 480 other students (and roughly 960 parents) and lord knows how many thousands upon thousands of siblings, grandparents, aunts and uncles related to the “surviving” 480 kids who are participating in one of the most extraordinary hoaxes of modern history.

Meanwhile, others said, Newtown, Connecticut and its environs was an outpost of Satanism and that most of the people in town were Satanists. That explained why virtually everyone was involved in the conspiracy designed to portray a non-event as a bloody massacre.

When sober patriot critics pointed out that Satanists are known to engage in *real* blood-letting and don't generally “fake” such events, preferring the very real slaughter of little children, those who were advocates of the theory that “the Satanists” had helped conjure the Sandy Hook hoax were hard-pressed to respond.

Others claimed there were people in Newtown who knew the whole affair was a “hoax” and wanted to speak out (or who were speaking out privately) but they didn't want their names revealed. Those people were either being blackmailed or coerced in some fashion.

In other words, an entire community—a town of nearly 30,000 people—was held under such control that not a single person would (or could) go public and blow the whistle and expose the hoax!

The theory is yours to choose: Either most of the people in the town were Satanists or otherwise somehow in on the plot or most of the people were somehow being prevented from daring to speak out.

And part of the whole big plot—so some say—is that (as we keep reminding you) there wasn't even really a functioning school at the structure in Sandy Hook where the “phony” shooting took place.

I kid you not.

Those unfamiliar with all of the give-and-take that erupted on the Internet simply have no idea how truly outlandish it all became.

It does get a little confusing, to be sure, but that didn't stop people from spreading the stories.

For God's sake, don't let anything stand in the way of a good story—especially if it attracts traffic to your Internet website (and brings you a bundle full of cash contributions).

On one occasion a very prominent “patriot” radio broadcaster extended his sympathies to the people of Newtown for the lives lost at Sandy Hook and then, minutes later, on the same broadcast, referred to the matter as a gigantic hoax that never happened.

Why the broadcaster felt the need to extend his sympathy to Newtown for a tragedy that hadn't really taken place remains a mystery (to me). But he had a lot of followers who hung on his every word.

All of that having been said, it's no surprise, when we continue to review the work of Gustave Le Bon—who provided the playbook for the Crisis Management Conspirators—to see that Le Bon had been able to project with absolute certainty that the insertion of wild claims into “The Crowd” would prove a perfect means of splitting the dissident movement from within.

Le Bon described what he called “the intolerance, dictatorialness and conservatism of crowds,” and recognizing this factor, the Crisis Management Conspirators played this phenomenon to the hilt.

These malicious manipulators knew full well that the moment cautious, detail-oriented, fact-focused researchers questioned the disinformation and nonsense that this would enrage those in “The Crowd” who had been coopted into what had essentially become a Sandy Hook Cult. Here's how Le Bon put it:

Crowds are only cognizant of simple and extreme sentiments; the opinions, ideas, and beliefs suggested to them are accepted or rejected as a whole, and considered as absolute truths or as not less absolute errors.

This is always the case with beliefs induced by a process of suggestion instead of engendered by reasoning. Every one is aware of the intolerance that accompanies religious beliefs, and of the despotic empire they exercise on men's minds.

Being in doubt as to what constitutes truth or error, and having, on the other hand, a clear notion of its strength, a crowd is as disposed to give authoritative effect to its inspirations as it is intolerant.

An individual may accept contradiction and discussion; a crowd will never do so. At public meetings the slightest contradiction on the part of an orator is immediately received with howls of fury and violent invective, soon followed by blows, and expulsion should the orator stick to his point.

And just as LeBon had suggested, those honest truth seekers who dared to question the fallacious (and patently ridiculous) stories that had been injected into discussion of Sandy Hook came under the most intense fire from otherwise good people—and the Crisis Management Conspirators absolutely loved it.

As incredible as it may seem to readers who will learn of this for the first time, even those who dared to suggest that perhaps children did actually die at Sandy Hook were called “traitors” by other patriots who had bought into the disinformation being inserted into the minds of patriots via the Crisis Management Conspirators working to discredit “conspiracy theories” in any form.

Thanks to the Orwellian manipulation—very real “mind control” at its best (and worst)—belief in Sandy Hook as having been a massive hoax was essentially being instituted as a virtual litmus test as to “who’s a real patriot and who isn’t.” Those who didn’t believe Sandy Hook was a massive hoax are denounced as having been “bribed, blackmailed, or coerced” or just having simply “changed sides.”

Veteran patriots said they had never seen anything like it—and they recognized it was because of the influence of the Internet (or rather, the influence of those Crisis Management Conspirators who were abusing the Internet for their own insidious purposes).

In short, Sandy Hook effectively emerged as a cult, with its own unique built-in theology that cannot be questioned. To raise any doubts about the foundation of the cult was—and still is—considered heresy. Anyone who doubted even the most unlikely portion of the Sandy Hook theories was portrayed as a “traitor to the patriot movement”—or that’s what the Crisis Management Conspirators wanted patriots to think!

The successful introduction by the Crisis Management Conspirators of their own disinformation into the patriot movement had set in motion a very real crisis—in and of itself—in which *real patriots were being crucified for standing up and calling out the real conspirators for trying to mislead patriots.*

One longtime critic of gun control was accused of lending support to pro-gun control forces because he believed children died at Sandy Hook—a total disconnect, of course, but illustrative of the kind of mind-set that was taking hold.

Another person was accused of being “pro-Obama” because he doubted some Sandy Hook theories, the apparent presumption being that since Sandy Hook took place under the hated Obama’s watch that anyone who believed the official story therefore had to be pro-Obama for believing the basic claim that a crazed lone gunman was responsible.

(On the other hand, though, as we’ve noted, some of the others who believed that there was a bigger story to Sandy Hook believed Israel’s Mossad had carried out the crime in order to hurt President Obama whereas others believed the Mossad did so in order to help him.)

So, as we said, choose your favorite theory—courtesy of Cass Sunstein and the Crisis Management Conspirators.

It was almost like Alice in Wonderland—definitely beyond belief. If there’s one thing we can be certain about, it’s this: There’s more to the Sandy Hook story than even the most dedicated conspiracy theorists understand—and that’s why they’ve been “hooked.”

The Crisis Management Conspirators (via Internet monitoring) were able to see precisely WHO spread the rumors via email and from WHAT websites and sources they got their information in the first place.

As a direct consequence of this one event and the frenzy surrounding it, the powers-that-be had an absolute first-ever 24/7 fool-proof method of monitoring communications and resources within the circles of the dissident movement.

The Sandy Hook venture itself was just stage one in the scheme, giving them the opportunity to observe and weigh the responses of the conspiracy theorists to the *actual* events that had occurred and to monitor their responses to the often-illogical and contradictory tales being bandied about by the Crisis Management Conspirators.

On the broader scale, in the bigger picture, the Crisis crowd was laying the groundwork to have—in the future—a more precise, more calibrated focus on the exchange of information by the conspiracy theorists and to be able to actually dominate and direct the course of their thinking altogether. And, naturally—if necessary—to discredit them in no uncertain terms in the minds of the general population.

Perhaps even more importantly, the Sunstein-inspired program of monitoring and manipulation now made it possible to lay the groundwork—as appropriate—in manipulating opinion during some *future* major event, perhaps one already well-planned in advance—another 9-11, if you will—or some scheme *still* in the works.

Sandy Hook was indeed a “false flag” of the first order—and it had the ultimate impact of totally misdirecting the attention of patriots from the real forces that were laying out the misinformation that was so thoroughly misdirecting them.

In the end, one of the most respected longtime patriot voices, Devvy Kidd, dared to put it all in perspective. On April 28, 2013, on her website at newswithviews.com, Kidd laid it on the line:

Over the past nearly two decades, every time some horrific “event” happens, wanna be “journalists” come out of the wood work with their conspiracy theories based on absolutely nothing. Bloggers who specialize in no facts, just rank speculation. Irresponsible people out to make a name for themselves or to get people to their web sites.

They have zero credibility and hurt the rest of us by being lumped together. I have debunked conspiracy theories in the past based on documentation. I get attacked as if I’m the bad guy for pursuing the truth! There are conspiracies and cover-ups, but we want the truth, not speculation.

What a damned shame there were not more voices of caution raised while the Sandy Hook affair was in its frenzy. But there were too many people in “The Crowd” who had been captivated by the virus of manufactured conspiracy fever that had been spawned in the Mind Control laboratories of the Crisis Management Conspirators.

And, if truth be told, there were many so-called “leaders” of the would-be “truth movement” who were afraid to dissent, fearful of being called “traitors” and accused of being “agents of Barack Obama and the New World Order” if they dared to say that the foolish madness inserted into the minds of truth seekers (via the machinations of the Conspiracy Management gang) was just that: a bunch of foolishness.

The whole Sandy Hook venture was largely a “private” affair, in that the circumstances surrounding the event were essentially limited to what did—or did not—take place within the confines of that elementary school in Newtown.

However, not long afterward—on April 15, 2013—with the very “public” event involving the Boston Marathon (on the very open and public streets of Boston) the Crisis Management Conspirators were able to fine tune what they had already honed into a specialized “science”: a tool of Orwellian manipulation of the first—and worst—order.

With Boston, the Sunstein thesis—now a live-action, real-time project in motion, having been successfully tested with Sandy Hook—was adapted to a much bigger, more broad-ranging event that (all of the nonsensical theories accompanying it notwithstanding) had all the earmarks of having been a very real “false flag” operation of Israel’s Mossad. But, once again, the truth seekers were misdirected . . .

CHAPTER THIRTY . . .

Who “The Crisis Actors” REALLY Are: How Truth Seekers Were Manipulated into Ignoring Genuine “False Flag” Terrorism and Focusing Instead on Irrelevant Lunacy

The manipulation by the Crisis Management Conspirators of the events at Sandy Hook was, in retrospect, a quite logical response to the phenomenon of 9-11 truthseeking (much of it Internet-based) which, in turn, had its own antecedents in the search for the truth surrounding the Oklahoma City bombing and the JFK assassination so many years before.

In that sense, we might suggest, there was indeed a secret connection, so to speak, between 9-11 and Sandy Hook—but it’s one that even the most fervent believers in the “big” story of Sandy Hook never realized, precisely because of the fact they had found themselves (most of them, to this day, unknowingly) caught in the web of disinformation being spun by the high-level Crisis Management Conspirators.

And one of the biggest cons of all perpetrated upon the legitimate truth seekers was the legend of “The Crisis Actors”—mentioned earlier—that came to be an article of faith surrounding Sandy Hook and later again, even more so, following the events at the Boston Marathon.

And as we’ve already noted (perhaps all too often) in the wake of Sandy Hook many people actually believed that there hadn’t even been any gunplay at all—that no children and no adults were shot that day, that it was all a big staged event, with the purported victims and their families (along with law enforcement) in on the deal.

This is where the now much-discussed topic of “The Crisis Actors” was brought into play. And, in many respects, it may have been one of the most ingenious scams ever pawned off on American patriots designed to misdirect their attention.

It was right out of Cass Sunstein’s playbook.

During the wake of Sandy Hook, people got so distracted talking about the Crisis Actors and the claim that “Lanza was dead the day before the shooting which really didn’t happen and in which no kids were really killed,” that, in many cases, they didn’t do what they should have done: Lobby forcefully against the gun control measures that were being crafted as a consequence of the tragedy at Sandy Hook.

Many patriots became genuinely convinced that by talking about “The Crisis Actors” that they were winning the day and convincing people of the dangers of gun control when, in fact, they were actually misdirecting good people and, for all intents and purposes, discrediting honest Americans who were opposed to gun control.

As a result of the widespread distribution of claims that Sandy Hook was a big fraud being perpetrated by “Crisis Actors” many Americans concluded that the opponents of gun control were trouble-makers, wild-eyed conspiracy theorists and just generally to be dismissed.

That, ultimately, was the aim of the Crisis Management Conspirators. Their introduction of the concept of “Crisis Actors” into the debate was part and parcel of the very real conspiracy—first outlined by Cass Sunstein—to discredit conspiracy theories in general.

And all of this undoubtedly did immense damage to the reputation of many good patriots who opposed gun control and who were led into the trap of focusing on the Crisis Actor legend rather than on the very real and important issue at hand.

And what is so remarkable is that, to this day, although patriotic folks who regularly discuss Sandy Hook and Boston speak in hushed (and not-so-hushed) tones about “The Crisis Actors” and the role that they supposedly played in those events, there is not one single individual who is able to say precisely “who” it was who first introduced the concept of the Crisis Actors into the vernacular of the Sandy Hook truth seekers. And that is telling, in and of itself.

We know, for example, following the JFK assassination, that it was Mark Lane who largely popularized the term “grassy knoll”—relating to the likely positioning in Dealey Plaza of one of the gunmen who fired on President Kennedy.

But Lane himself is the first to admit that he first heard the term “grassy knoll” used by one of the assassination witnesses, Jean Hill, who used that term in an interview. And Hill herself has said that this just happened to be the particular phraseology that popped into her head in seeking a way to describe that geographic location in Dealey Plaza.

And that’s how the term “grassy knoll” ultimately came into widespread parlance, not only in reference to the JFK assassination but also in reference to “conspiracy theories” in general.

But there is absolutely nobody who can explain just who it was who “figured out” that Crisis Actors had been utilized as part of the Sandy Hook (and later the Boston Marathon) conspiracy.

And the reason for that is that this whole concept of Crisis Actors having been dispatched as part of the conspiracy was a creation of the Crisis Management Conspirators themselves.

Now let it be said that there really *are* people known as Crisis Actors. They *do* exist. They’ve been around for a while.

However, the proponents of the Crisis Actors theory relating to Sandy Hook (and later the Boston Marathon) would have people believe that the existence of Crisis Actors is some deep dark secret, that they are

part of a long-standing high-level covert operation kept from the public, perhaps a creation of Homeland Security or the CIA or some combination of elements of the emerging American Police State, paid agents of the vaunted military-industrial-complex.

It's an exciting theory, to be sure, but the truth is that—for years—you have been able to go to the Internet and find a number of Internet websites of real-life profit-making businesses that train and provide Crisis Actors who interact with government (local, state and federal) as well as private industries and enterprises in preparing to deal with crisis events of various kinds, including mass shootings, hostage situations, earthquakes, fires, riots—all manner of chaos.

One such business engaging in the Crisis Actor industry (which is what it amounts to) is crisisactors.org.

On the website of that company, their promotional material reads: "Crisis Actors: Trained Players and Actors Making it Real," stating that their mission is: "Helping schools and first responders create realistic drills, full-scale exercises, high-fidelity simulations, and interactive 3D films." The website even includes a section called "Crisis Acting News" highlighting a variety of events in which their skills and services have been utilized (and *openly publicized* in newspapers and televised by broadcast outlets in local communities across the country).

Here are just a few examples from crisisactors.org, citing Internet links to some of the newspapers and broadcast outlets that have cited the work of Crisis Actors in their particular communities.

- Active Shooter Training At Closed Elementary School in Plymouth - *Patch.com*
- Local law enforcement agencies take active shooter training - *KOB.com*
- Lower Burrell police conduct 'active shooter' training at Burrell High School - *Tribune-Review*
- HSI holding 'active shooter' training in NM - *Alamogordo Daily News*
- Active-shooter drill to be conducted at Fulton-Montgomery Community College - *WRGB*
- New Canaan To Conduct Active Shooter Drill On Thursday - *The Daily Voice*
- Waterloo Schools Active Shooter Training - *KGAN TV*

All across the United States today there are members of local police and fire departments, emergency response units—even members of the National Guard—who have worked with Crisis Actors on a regular basis.

The existence, then, of Crisis Actors is no big secret. But it wasn't until the Crisis Management Conspirators deliberately hyped the legend (via the Internet) that Crisis Actors were part of the conspiracy at Sandy Hook that many people became aware of their existence.

The Crisis Management Conspirators inserted the legend of the Crisis Actors onto the Internet with the expectation that it would become a part of the lore of Sandy Hook and help add confusion and—more importantly—play a significant part in discrediting conspiracy theories and conspiracy theorists in the minds of the broad general public.

Essentially, in relation to Sandy Hook, in particular, the Crisis Actors Theory held that, for example, Robbie Parker, the father of one of the children killed at Sandy Hook, was actually a Crisis Actor.

The claim was based on the fact that—just prior to giving a public statement expressing his horror at the loss of his child—Parker smiled and laughed and then asked if the cameras were on yet and then, while speaking, referred to written notes. Nobody who had actually lost a child under such tragic circumstances, it was proclaimed, would actually smile or laugh. Nor would they need to refer to written notes.

Such allegations are patently ridiculous. People react differently to tragedy. Some people put on a brave face when confronted with tragedy. And most people have never been confronted with a horde of reporters and television cameras converging on their home in the wake of such an internationally-publicized tragedy in which they (and their dead child) have unwittingly become a part.

The idea someone would need to rely on notes to speak publicly is not so outrageous. Very few people are trained in public speaking and often need notes, just as even professional speakers rely on written texts when giving their own presentations. But the fact that Robbie Parker was using notes was suddenly “proof” that he was a Crisis Actor!

So when the Crisis Management Conspirators put out the idea that Robbie Parker was a Crisis Actor whose child hadn't been killed, Parker began receiving threats for “play acting” and the controlled media (allied with the Crisis Management Conspirators) immediately brought this to the attention of the general public who were quite correctly horrified that “those conspiracy theorists” would actually question the grief of a mourning parent and suggest that he was “faking” his child's death.

What most of those who bought into the idea Parker was a Crisis Actor never seemed to consider was the point that if he was a Crisis Actor, he probably wouldn't have needed written notes when he “performed” for the cameras. Actors—you see—rely upon their skills to remember their lines. Actors generally don't use cue cards or at least not ones that they hold right there in front of them while speaking!

Later, it was even alleged that Parker's dead child was actually photographed in the presence of Barack Obama when he visited Newtown to meet with the families. In other words, that the "phony" Parker and his family (all part of the conspiracy) had brazenly dared to allow the supposedly dead child to be shown to be alive after it was said that she had been killed at Sandy Hook.

The claim was based on the fact that the surviving sisters of the dead child bore a striking resemblance to the victim—that happens in families, you know—and that one of the children in the picture with Obama seemed to be wearing the same dress that the dead child had previously been photographed wearing. That was "proof" that it was the dead child who was, it was said, still alive.

But any family with multiple sons or daughters knows that the clothing of older children is passed on to younger children. But then, again, when it came time to promote the idea of Crisis Actors—and the theme that "no children died at Sandy Hook"—simple points such as that seemed to get lost in the Crisis Management Conspiracy Barndance.

In another instance, a parent of one of the dead children was accused of being a Crisis Actor because the parent said in an interview that one of his surviving children said that she wanted to urge President Obama to support gun control. No child in grade school, it was said, would be thinking about a political issue such as gun control. Especially, it was added, after one of her siblings had been killed.

The idiocy of such a claim should be obvious. School children do have political opinions and even "vote" in mock presidential elections every four years—from first grade through graduation—even if they don't necessarily understand the political issues.

Young children *do* know who the president is and in this "Information Age" they do hear about issues such as gun control, in particular, on a 24/7 basis, whether on television or radio or even on the Internet, and especially after such a crisis as Sandy Hook.

And it's entirely possible that a child who had lost a sibling at a school shooting *would* want to express her concerns about gun control to "the president" who is perceived as the man who rules America and who makes important decisions about big issues such as gun control.

In fact, they said, a lot of the well-known Sandy Hook personalities featured in the media were actors—why, they never even lived in Sandy Hook at all! (Just as they had said that the school was not even a functioning school at the time of the purported shooting!)

Various cuts of what is called "raw" media footage of one Sandy Hook celebrity—a notably obnoxious character named Gene Rosen (a veritable stereotype for a particular type of Jewish caricature often seen in

Hollywood comedy)—telling bits and pieces of what he claimed to have seen, was cited as proof Rosen had “practiced” his lines (like an actor) and that the story he was telling was just not true.

Rosen—who was clearly a publicity hound who reveled in his brief brush with the proverbial “15 minutes of fame”—was over-the-top to the point of being annoying and—in fact—the media people who had interviewed Rosen had taped him at various moments and Rosen was clearly fine-tuning, even rehearsing what he was about to say in the various “cuts” of the raw footage that later popped up on the Internet.

As such it was immediately insinuated that Rosen was a Crisis Actor dispatched by the powers-that-be to craft a bit of film propaganda for the benefit of the American public to help perpetrate the “lie” that there had been a shooting at the school.

But here is what is important to remember . . .

What all of the patriot conspiracy theorists seemed to miss was this big question: How was it that this raw footage—taped by a cameraman from the Controlled Media—just happened to be leaked to the conspiracy theorists as “proof” that Rosen was a Crisis Actor?

Clearly, there were people in the Controlled Media—in league with the Crisis Management Conspirators—who were deliberately helping propagate the legend of the Crisis Actors by leaking raw footage such as this.

They knew with absolute certainty that the people in “The Crowd” who had bought into the Crisis Actors theory would jump on the Rosen story in a heartbeat. And that is precisely what they did.

In the end, you see, the *real* Crisis Actors were *not* the parents of the murdered children (or even the ridiculous Gene Rosen).

Instead the Crisis Actors were actually those “cyber shells” (posing as “truth seekers”) who were acting out a very specific role—acting on behalf of the Crisis Management Conspirators—in bombarding the Internet with all of the outlandish stories that distracted patriots and truth seekers from the big picture and thereby helping discredit all forms of conspiracy theories (and conspiracy theorists) in general.

It’s just so damned obvious.

In fact, it’s typical Zionist Israeli trickery:

- (1) Operating in plain sight;
- (2) Standing there in vampire’s garb, pointing at someone dressed as an angel, and shouting, “There’s the vampire over there!” and
- (3) Thoroughly distracting everyone from the big picture.

This frequent Zionist tactic of accusing others of what they are in fact guilty of has been aptly described as “accusatory projection” or “accusatory inversion.”

The Crisis Actors theme got ever more ridiculous as the story was repeated again and again. At one point it was even claimed a catering truck—said to be on the scene at Sandy Hook—had been dispatched to cater food and beverages for the Crisis Actors at work perpetuating the conspiracy, just as—it was pointed out—catering trucks will be found on the scene when Hollywood films are being made “on location.”

I’ve personally seen one of these catering trucks parked just a few blocks from my own home on Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C. when actor Clint Eastwood was filming a rooftop chase scene for his action film *In the Line of Fire*. Despite this, however, I sincerely doubt that the Sandy Hook “conspiracy” was so fine-tuned that the conspirators sent a catering truck to keep the Crisis Actors at Sandy Hook well nourished.

Yet, I am here to tell you that the Crisis Management Conspirators managed to convince a lot of well meaning people that this is actually what really happened. (Oh, those nasty caterers—conspirators all!)

And here’s something about the Crisis Actors disinformation that needs to be mentioned—and this will astound many readers who will learn about this for the first time . . .

In fact, one of the most vociferous proponents of the Crisis Actors theory—a character who uses the name “DallasGoldbug”—also put forth the following assertions regarding other “actors” he claims to have discovered posturing in the public arena:

- John F. Kennedy did not die in Dallas but reinvented himself as future president Jimmy Carter;
- A single woman posed as not only actress Marilyn Monroe but also former First Ladies Jacqueline Kennedy and Rosalyn Carter;
- Former Vice President Nelson Rockefeller was really country and western singer Tex Ritter;
- Billionaire David Rockefeller is actually popular conspiracy theorist Jordan Maxwell;
- David Rockefeller, Jr. is another popular conspiracy theorist William Cooper (who was killed by police in 2001);
- Famed country singer Patsy Cline posed as Marina Oswald, the wife of JFK’s accused assassin Lee Harvey Oswald;
- Comic actor Chevy Chase poses as Sen. Jay Rockefeller;
- Former Philadelphia Mayor Frank Rizzo is now posing as “America’s Toughest Sheriff” Joe Arpaio of Arizona;
- Infamous Nazi figure Adolf Eichmann was really the popular singer and motion picture star Bing Crosby; and
- No less than Adolf Hitler was actually Walt Disney.

And here are three of my personal favorites from “DallasGoldbug” involving three individuals whom I have known quite well:

- * Nelson Rockefeller’s son, Rodman, poses as veteran JFK assassination researcher Mark Lane;
- Famed former State Rep. David Duke, is actually a Hollywood actor named Thomas Haden Church; and
- Actor Jonathan Winters posed as longtime *American Free Press* “Bildenberg Hound” James P. Tucker, Jr.;

DallasGoldbug posted “convincing” video and photographic evidence that “proved” these contentions, yet many who were caught up in the claims about Crisis Actors at Sandy Hook and Boston had no idea that the Crisis Actors story was also inextricably linked to this lunacy.

In fact, Gustave LeBon—the grand guru of the the Crisis Management Conspirators—had described how the “crowd” could be dazzled by all sorts of images and in the aftermath of the Boston Maraton bombing, “The Crowd” of our modern day was indeed captivated by dazzling images which they believed “proved” that there had been hanky panky on the streets of Boston.

In fact, many “truth seekers” picked up the stories being put out by the phony patriots—the Crisis Actors working for the Sunstein gang—that there wasn’t even really any bombing at all! It was akin to the claim—which had already proven successful in winning credence with the real patriots—that there hadn’t even been a shooting at Sandy Hook.

And while the whole story of what really happened at Boston has yet to be unraveled, what we do know is that two young Muslims (the Tsarnaev brothers) were accused of the crime—yet another Muslim “false flag” akin to the 9-11 tragedy.

And we also know that evidence indicates that the intelligence services of the United States, Russia—and certainly Israel—had their eyes on the Tsarnaevs for a long time prior to the bombing, just as the ADL and other Israeli-connected elements were “monitoring” Timothy McVeigh prior to the Oklahoma City bombing.

However—at this juncture—we don’t know the *entire* scenario, but we *do* know there has been a lot of disinformation put into circulation designed to deflect attention away from Israel which is certainly (beyond question) the prime beneficiary of the crime as a consequence of the purported danger from the Muslim world continuing to be in the forefront of the mind (and concerns) of the American people.

In short, Boston was simply a replay of the 9-11 false flag that redirected American thinking in the wake of that tragedy.

It was a reinvigoration of the template for terror utilized in 9-11 and in the Oklahoma bombing and in the JFK assassination involving, yet again, the widespread dissemination of carefully-crafted disinformation designed to cover Israeli involvement in those acts of terror.

(For my own part, from the beginning, it has been my *opinion* that Israel *was* behind the Boston bombing for the precise purpose of conjuring up another Muslim “false flag.” I expressed this view in a broadcast interview at theuglytruth.wordpress.com with Mark Glenn who shares my view on this matter.)

Yet, the Crisis Management Conspirators successfully distracted truth seekers—who were convinced that, once again, the authorities were covering up the truth about the Boston bombing—by cranking up the Crisis Actors legend (first spawned in the wake of Sandy Hook).

Rather than focusing on *who was behind* the bombing, truth seekers focused *instead* on stories—with accompanying videos and photographic images of the chaos following the bombing—planted on the Internet in conjunction with the insistent claim that Crisis Actors were busy on the streets of Boston detaching false arms and legs and faking injuries and throwing around buckets of stage blood for the benefit of video cameras.

All of the imagery captured the attention of the patriots who suddenly showed little—if any—interest in trying to determine who was responsible for the Muslim “false flag” that the Controlled Media was waving in the face of a horrified American public.

Here is how Le Bon described precisely this kind of manipulation.

Crowds being only capable of thinking in images are only to be impressed by images. It is only images that terrify or attract them and become motives of action.

For this reason theatrical representations, in which the image is shown in its most clearly visible shape, always have an enormous influence on crowds. Bread and spectacular shows constituted for the plebeians of ancient Rome the ideal of happiness, and they asked for nothing more.

Throughout the successive ages this ideal has scarcely varied. Nothing has a greater effect on the imagination of crowds of every category than theatrical representations.

The entire audience experiences at the same time the same emotions, and if these emotions are not at once transformed into acts, it is because the most unconscious spectator cannot ignore that he is the victim of illusions, and that he has laughed or wept over imaginary adventures.

Le Bon realized—and the Crisis Management Conspirators recognized that he was absolutely correct—that these kind of images were ideal for the purpose of Crowd Control and mass manipulation:

Whatever strikes the imagination of crowds presents itself under the shape of a startling and very clear image, freed from all accessory explanation, or merely having as accompaniment a few marvellous or mysterious facts: examples in point are a great victory, a great miracle, a great crime, or a great hope. Things must be laid before the crowd as a whole, and their genesis must never be indicated.

A hundred petty crimes or petty accidents will not strike the imagination of crowds in the least, whereas a single great crime or a single great accident will profoundly impress them, even though the results be infinitely less disastrous than those of the hundred small accidents put together.

In the wake of Boston, the theme of “Crisis Actors” got further (and quite considerable) mileage with the use of such imagery. With Le Bon’s assertions about “The Crowd”—and its susceptibility to incorporating such images into its thinking—the Crisis Management gang kept conspiracy theorists busy.

One widely circulated proof of the “conspiracy” was a selection of several frames from a video of the bombing. A few frames were “analyzed”—a few frames that represented just a few seconds of time—and were “found” to show a woman (said to be a Crisis Actor) “giving hand signs” and helping other Crisis Actors fake blood and injuries.

To do all of this—live—before very REAL people who were not Crisis Actors but who WERE on the scene, would take more than seconds to accomplish successfully.

Anyone who has ever participated in the taping of a television show or even an amateur home movie—let alone a serious film production—knows how much time and work is involved making just one “incident” look real, -and that it can’t be accomplished in just seconds!

But most people—including a lot of good patriots—have never been involved in any such production and don’t have any idea that even one second in, for example, an old-style 8mm movie, can amount to as many as 18 different frames. Meaning, of course, that those who were micro-analyzing the films that they said “proved” there had been fakery were actually analyzing milli-seconds, for God’s sake!

Such simple facts were lost in the “Crisis Actors Shuffle” that accompanied the frenzy over the Boston bombing.

A lot of good patriots fell into what we might call, for want of a better way of describing it, "the Trap of Belief," because they had become familiar, in years past, with people who were quite accurately and correctly analyzing the famous (although remarkably brief) bit of film known as the Zapruder Film of the JFK assassination.

Again and again over the years a variety of analysts had de-constructed the film, frame by frame, to demonstrate the point that it was clear, on film, that the official Warren Commission version of the JFK assassination was repudiated by what purported to be an actual amateur 8mm film taken at the time of the JFK assassination.

(Now, ironically, there are those who say that Zapruder film itself is some sort of forgery or an altered version of the original film or even a combination of several films made to appear to be one. And the truth is that past and present technology does make such things possible.)

As such, having seen (over some 50 years) such analysis of the Zapruder film (and other images of the JFK assassination) again and again, on video, on the Internet, in books and magazines, patriots and truth seekers became accustomed to this technique of conspiracy inquiry. And knowing that this was the case, following Sandy Hook and Boston, the Crisis Management Conspirators went assiduously to work and deliberately played on this when they began hyping the claims that Crisis Actors had staged false injuries (in a fake bombing) for the benefit of the American population at large.

The consequence of this was that when honest truth-seekers began circulating the stories that videos of the bombing were "fakes," many serious-minded folks in the general public began to think, quite frankly, that these truth seekers were just plain crazy.

There were people from all over the United States who had come to the Boston Marathon and they went home to tell friends and family about their narrow brush with disaster, only to hear that there were conspiracy theorists on the Internet who were saying that the bombing didn't happen and that nobody really lost an arm or a leg.

And the "proof" was a few seconds of one film that went viral on the Internet which convinced the truth seekers that it was all a big lie!

If you have any doubts about this, go out and purchase a DVD of some current "action" film and listen to the director's commentary. You'll learn how, for example, one scene in a Hollywood film which occupies just a second or two (on film) can actually take up to as much as two or three days to film (sometimes on multiple locations, no less) not to mention the introduction of a wide array of computer-generated imagery and other technological advances, many of which didn't even exist as little as ten or fifteen years ago.

Did you really think that was a big ship sinking in the middle of the North Atlantic in James Cameron's classic film *Titanic*?

Did you really think that real people were falling down and hurting themselves as the ship sank?

Of course you didn't!

In fact, some of the most mundane moments in that wide-ranging disaster film were actually the work of clever Hollywood legerdemain.

Even the relatively brief and simple scene of the film's romantic duo—Kate Winslett and Leonardo DiCaprio—at the stern of the ship when Winslett's character is threatening to jump overboard and commit suicide involved *endless hours of filming* using *several different stages* and *multiple means of technological wizardry*.

If you were among those who were caught up in the legends surrounding Crisis Actors at the Boston Marathon and the stories on the Internet purporting to analyze just a moment or two of the events that took place there, then read that preceding paragraph again—no, in fact, read it twice—and consider the ramifications . . .

As we said—and this is critical to understand—the point is that even a moment of drama on film can take literally *days* to produce and simply can not be carried out in just a few split seconds.

But those Crisis Management Conspirators who have been purveying the Crisis Actors false flag to mislead truth seekers know that most people have no idea how technologically advanced film-making has become, even at the same time it remains time-consuming and requires vast participation by multiple people at various levels

So, then, in the context of the events at the Boston Marathon, what does all of this mean?

It's very simple . . .

If the conspirators behind the events in Boston wanted to produce a piece of film to convince unwitting Americans that a bombing *did* take place which injured many people—including those who lost arms and legs—they did *not* have to dispatch hordes of "Crisis Actors" onto the scene to engage in complicated motions of "reacting" to a bomb and then rolling about on the crowd pretending to be injured, hysterically clinging to severed arms and legs, throwing about fake blood, etc.

That just isn't how it works.

IF there HAD been a major conspiracy to "fake" all of these things, the whole process COULD (and WOULD) have been done beforehand using high-tech computer generated images produced in a laboratory.

The so-called Crisis Actors didn't even have to be ANYWHERE NEAR the bomb site and positioned where "honest witnesses" could have seen anything suspicious such as what has been claimed to have happened.

For serious truth seekers—particularly those who were caught up in the legend of Crisis Actors at Boston who were purportedly busy faking injuries, throwing around fake blood, detaching prosthetic legs and arms, etc—a careful review of the wide-ranging “special features” section of the DVD of James Cameron’s *Titanic* is well worth their time.

And the truth is that since Cameron’s classic first appeared on the screen in 1997—16 years ago—computer technology has grown by extraordinary leaps and bounds, such that Cameron’s own remarkable visual graphics in *Titanic* are, in many respects, almost extraordinarily antiquated by many new developments in the field.

In fact, the “special features” section of virtually any DVD of any motion picture or television drama—especially those involving a lot of action—often provide a literal step-by-step videographic run-down of the amazing techniques of film-making, in particular the amazing CGI—computer-generated imagery—that has become so prevalent in even the most minimal ways that the average viewer would never expect.

For example, on the DVD of the third season of the now-defunct crime drama, *Body of Proof*, one can see how outdoor scenes (filmed in Los Angeles but supposedly taking place in Philadelphia) are altered via CGI to eliminate palm trees from the image that is finally seen by the television viewer. Another scene deconstructed on that DVD demonstrates how the image (and sound) of a railroad train moving through a railroad yard is completely erased by CGI, such that all of the other action (and sound) taking place remains undisturbed.

In other words, film-making technology has reached such a highly-advanced level that:

- Virtually any scene or event can practically be conjured out of almost thin air. What appears to be a human speaking and moving about may, in fact, be a CGI, or even a robot with a talking, smiling human face imposed by computer upon it.
- Any piece of real film imagery can be so altered that the final version of the film completely eliminates action that did take place or altered to include action that actually took place elsewhere and was then inserted by computer onto that imagery.

Now—when confronted with such realities about the nature of film production and how quite ridiculous it is to suggest that Crisis Actors engaged in such complex (and quite unnecessary) on-site antics in Boston—a lot of red-faced truth seekers (who do realize they have been conned) fall back on the claim that the high-level conspirators behind Boston *deliberately* staged faulty video presentations that were easily “refutable” because—they say—the conspirators actually *wanted* the American people to know that the Boston bombing was a hoax.

The apparent underlying theme here is that “Nothing is for real. Everything is a lie. And the people who are responsible for these lies actually do want people to know that they are lies. That the people can do nothing to combat this conspiracy that operates in tandem with the Controlled Media in America.”

That sounds good. It has a certain appeal to a certain mindset. But it doesn't reflect the reality that, in fact, most Americans simply do not have any idea that the Internet is rife with rumors about Crisis Actors.

But what a growing number of Americans *do* believe—as a consequence of propaganda from the Controlled Media—is that those people who are called “conspiracy theorists” by the media have some really crazy ideas and that they don't believe that there was really a shooting in Sandy Hook that took the lives of 20 little children or that there wasn't even really a bombing in Boston.

And many Americans now believe that *anything* that reeks of a conspiracy theory—even relating to the JFK assassination or the Oklahoma bombing or 9-11—is the work of paranoid minds whose opinions are to be dismissed, along with (in particular) the idea that Israel had anything to do with those tragedies.

That was precisely the design of those who helped make the truth seekers look “crazy” by feeding them a diet of extraordinary claims about Sandy Hook and Boston that took hold on the Internet like wild-fire, even as the Crisis Management Conspirators were monitoring the communication networks between patriots here in the United States (and around the world) who were disseminating these stories.

The bottom line is that what many came to believe about Crisis Actors at Sandy Hook and Boston (along with other similar nonsense) is just one big fat fraud—a lie—a distraction—deliberately perpetrated by the Crisis Management Conspirators to make truth seekers look silly.

The real “BIG STORY” that has not yet set in or been realized and understood is this:

The Crowd Control (and very real Mind Control) tactics—first laid out by Cass Sunstein—have been successfully set in motion and the long-term damage to serious inquiry into very real conspiracies—past and present and those of the future—has been costly and inestimable.

We can only imagine what will happen when another very real crisis comes along and wonder what kind of “management”—or mismanagement, as the case may be—will occur. We can only ponder the manner in which truth seekers will be once again be utterly misdirected and further marginalized.

What happened with Sandy Hook and Boston is a very real lesson America's “alternative” media should learn from—before it's too late.

BY WAY OF A CONCLUSION . . .

It is Time for “The Stand”: The Beginning of a New Chapter—a New Era— in the Story of the Battle for Mankind’s Survival

The truth is that we MUST fight the REAL conspirators and their bought-and-paid for “cyber shills”—the REAL Crisis Actors—who have been actively operating inside in the independent and “alternative” media in America in furtherance of the insidious agenda to counter and discredit “conspiracy theories” laid forth by Cass Sunstein and carried out by the Crisis Management Conspirators in the aftermath of Sandy Hook and Boston.

The madness and disruption that they have caused must be countered—and it will be if enough good patriots come to their senses and realize the manner in which they have been manipulated.

It is my sincere hope that this book, *False Flags*, will play a considerable part in alerting people to the reality of this danger.

No longer can we—or will we—permit anonymous sources to run amuck on the Internet or anywhere else providing us “inside scoops” and nonsensical “analysis” that will misdirect our attention from the big picture and the real issues that must be confronted. We must resolve—at this time—to banish the trouble-makers and the sensationalists and the rumor-mongers from our ranks.

That is why, beginning right now, we must begin the process of writing a new chapter—launching a new era—in the war against the forces that seek to impose a global imperium upon the United States and the peoples of this world.

Yes, I am talking about what we have come to call the New World Order and its internationalist agenda which—if truth be told—is laid out all too clearly in the pages of the collective body of works known as the Talmud, a candid—if insidious—framework for planetary conquest at the expense of every nation and every people with one group (and one group alone) ultimately slated to reign supreme.

My book, *The New Babylon*, explored the origins and evolution of this Grand Design. But in this volume, *False Flags*, I have outlined (and I hope in a way that is indisputable) the nature of some very real (and more prominent) intrigues and acts of terror that these conspirators have utilized as part of their drive for world rule.

However, those misdeeds have only been a small part of the bigger picture. As Willis Carto’s historical journal, *The Barnes Review*, continues to demonstrate, all throughout recorded history humankind has been subjected to all manner of corruption and misdirection emanating from (time and again) the same singular sources of war and revolution.

The sorry fact is that—for many years, but especially since the advent of the Internet—responsible truth-seekers and independent news sources like *American Free Press* have been bedeviled—besieged—on a daily basis by a relentless plethora of outrageous disinformation confusing honest efforts to bring forth important facts about history and the issues of the day.

We have found an extraordinary array of irresponsible sources spinning some outlandish claims that confuse matters further. However, *American Free Press* has always diligent in seeking to base its stories on stick to what its editors truly believe to be the facts and has refused to publish any story because “it sounds good” or because somebody thinks “there might be something to it.”

As Sgt. Joe Friday used to say: “Just the facts.”

However, considering all of this, you won't be surprised to learn that following Sandy Hook and Boston, *American Free Press* came under fire for refusing to hype the Crisis Actors stories that gripped many good people who were exposed to those claims on the Internet.

One veteran patriot actually stopped supporting AFP because AFP wouldn't lend its credibility to publicizing these stories.

However, it is no coincidence that he was influenced into so doing by a vindictive individual known to have long-standing ties to certain elements in the “alternative” media generally perceived to be under the discipline of forces linked to the intelligence community and its allies in Israel's Mossad.

And it's no coincidence this same character who sought to sabotage AFP among its supporters is one of those who propagates the claim there was a “Muslim” connection to the Oklahoma City bombing.

The irony of all of this is that AFP—and I—have been slammed by the Controlled Media for allegedly promoting “conspiracy theories” when all we have done is report the facts, however uncomfortable they may be for some very real conspirators.

And—quite obviously—the book you now hold in your hands has been a veritable catalogue of conspiracy theories relating to some of the most momentous events of our time. Yet—thanks to the intrigues of the Crisis Management Conspirators—there will be (as there already have been) stories circulating on the Internet that “Michael Collins Piper is really a secret Zionist agent.” And some people actually believe that.

And so it goes.

You are damned if you do—and damned if you don't.

It is all part of the audacious Zionist control tactic of confusing the issues and creating havoc, thereby discrediting truth seekers, not only among their supporters but within the ranks of the general public.

In fact, over the summer of 2013, an array of attacks on *American Free Press* (AFP) by high-level media forces focused on “conspiracy theories.” Conservative voices such as *The Wall Street Journal* and *National Review* loudly expressed their view that it is beyond the pale that AFP puts forth alternative explanations to government-sponsored theories—the official “party line”—on a wide variety of matters.

On August 6, 2013 a front-page article in *The Wall Street Journal* (WSJ) sought to implicate *American Free Press* as an ideological force that in some way—never quite explained—played a part in instigating the bombing at the Boston Marathon.

The WSJ based its tenuous claim—some call it a “conspiracy theory”—on the fact the late Tamerlan Tsarnaev, the older of the two Chechen-born brothers accused of the bombing, was introduced to AFP by a disabled older American man for whom Tsarnaev’s mother was a caregiver and with whom Tsarnaev discussed political affairs.

AFP was cited as among the publications—described as “extremist” and focused on “far flung conspiracy theories” relating to 9-11 and the Oklahoma City bombing—found in Tsarnaev’s apartment. The WSJ was also distressed Tsarnaev had doubts relating to popular stories about “the Holocaust” and that he even possessed a copy of *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* (more about which in a moment).

The meandering WSJ article—a muddled smear—was cobbled together to suggest AFP’s point of view may have influenced the Tsarnaevs and propelled them to violence.

However, the WSJ did not mention whether Tsarnaev, a Muslim, may have read and been angered by anti-Muslim screeds appearing regularly in the WSJ or in other like-minded pro-Israel publications such as *The Weekly Standard*, *National Review*, the Internet-based World Net Daily or the American Jewish Committee’s *Commentary*—all among many journals that feed readers a steady diet of Muslim bashing, designed to defame Muslims and much more likely to inflame Muslims than anything published in AFP or any other “independent” media.

Published by billionaire Rupert Murdoch, the WSJ also failed to note that Murdoch had a long-standing axe to grind with AFP, going back to the early 1980s when AFP’s editors—then affiliated with *The Spotlight*—exposed Murdoch as a “front” for the Rothschild dynasty, a fact suppressed in all other accounts of Murdoch’s rise to fortune.

It just so happens that Murdoch’s top lawyer—Howard Squadron, president of the American Jewish Congress and chair of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations—also played a pivotal role (at that very time) in the initial stages of a conspiracy to destroy *The Spotlight*, one that ultimately succeeded.

So it's no coincidence that all—and we do mean all—of AFP's critics invariably claim AFP propagates "conspiracy theories."

Nor is it a coincidence that it always seems to be Jewish groups and pro-Israel voices (such as the aforementioned publications, along with their allies at the Anti-Defamation League) that are perpetually shouting about the "dangers" of "conspiracy theories"?

The irony is that these very complainers—and the Controlled Media—are first and foremost in talking, on virtually a 24/7 basis, about "conspiracies" (real or imagined—often the latter) they claim threaten the Jews or the survival of Israel and/or "democracy in America" and Western Civilization, all which are conflated to mean the same thing.

Every day there's something in a major newspaper, the big magazines, or on the broadcast networks or the Internet about some conspiracy of this sort. And we are supposed to accept, as a matter of fact, that these conspiracies are real, whereas any other theories not approved by the people who control the media are not.

It's not just "the Holocaust" they talk about—and, of course, they talk about that all of the time. It's worse. Regular "threats" harped on include "the rise of anti-Semitism," accompanied by a host of terrorist plots by "right wing extremists" and Muslims in every corner mosque.

Actually, as the record shows, virtually all of these so-called plots seem to have been orchestrated, in the first place, by the FBI utilizing a shameless parade of its own quite sordid informants.

And it just so happens that the ADL is always in the public eye (and behind the scenes) telling the FBI and other law enforcement which alleged conspirators deserve to be targeted for special treatment.

As far back as 1944—when Franklin Roosevelt conducted a mass sedition trial aimed at Americans who had been critics of his drive to get the U.S. involved in World War II—it was the ADL that fed the FBI (and its corrupt director, J. Edgar Hoover) the "data" used to conjure up the sedition indictments against those Americans in the first place.

Today, things haven't changed. If anything, it's gotten worse.

And have you noticed that if anyone dares mention that the Media Monopoly—which promotes these approved conspiracy theories—is controlled by Jewish families and financial interests with interlocking connections to the plutocratic elite who dominate the Federal Reserve money monopoly, this absolute fact is dismissed as an "anti-Semitic canard"—part of yet another "conspiracy to defame the Jewish people" that supposedly originated with the aforementioned *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, which they claim is a "notorious forgery."

It is a "myth," they insist, that Jewish power predominates in the major media in America today.

A myth? Well, note that the following media outlets are all controlled by Jewish interests: ABC, CBS, NBC, CNN, MSNBC, Fox, *The New York Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *The New York Post*, *The New York Daily News*, *The Washington Post*, *The Los Angeles Times*, *The Chicago Tribune* and *Time*, along with the now-defunct (but long influential) *U.S. News and World Report* and *Newsweek*.

This does not include dozens of other big magazines (such as *The New Yorker*, *Parade* and *Vanity Fair*) and smaller newspapers across the country (such as *The Harrisburg Patriot* and *The Cleveland Plain-Dealer*; and *The New Orleans Times-Picayune* among others) controlled by the Newhouse family, major financial backers of the ADL.

In truth, none of these publications are mentioned in the *Protocols* that were, in fact, crafted before many of these publications (and certainly before all of the broadcast networks) came into being.

Are the *Protocols* really a “hoax”? Well, responsible research into their history demonstrates they were the work of a famous Russian-born Jewish philosopher, Asher Ginsberg, who led one of the factions in the late 19th Century gatherings of the World Zionist Congress.

While Ginsberg may indeed have plagiarized language used in other works to flesh out the rhetorical foundation of the *Protocols*—leading to the claim the *Protocols* are a fraud—my book *The New Babylon* summarizes the actual history of this much-talked-about work.

It is often also alleged that, in the 1920s—when automotive genius Henry Ford, was publishing a newspaper critical of rising Jewish power in America—that Ford’s reportage was based on the *Protocols*. Nothing could be further from the truth. Ford’s articles were thoroughly-documented presentations examining the Jewish role in the American arena.

And what’s so intriguing is that Ford’s articles of the 1920s reflect the same trends in the United States today. Simply change the names and you’ll find a new breed of intriguers who are heirs to those of Ford’s day. And it is they who are the loudest in screaming about “conspiracy theories,” when, of course, they are the biggest conspirators of all.

And, of course, in the meantime, these big-time conspirators are busy making sure that serious inquiry into the conspiracies that they are engaged in are covered up or otherwise misdirected. Sandy Hook and Boston proved so very much how effectively this could be done.

It already happened, in a far-less-technologically sophisticated variety of respects—as we have seen—with the JFK assassination, the Oklahoma City bombing and with 9-11.

In regard to the JFK assassination, I cannot help but weep over the fact that so many patriots are so thoroughly misdirected by the claim that JFK’s chauffeur fired the fatal head shot that killed the president!

And there are others who latched on nonsensical claims that JFK didn't really die in Dallas—that he actually participated in a Vatican-sponsored plot (I kid you not) to fake his own assassination.

According to the story, the Vatican sensed that JFK was "breaking" with the Vatican's control over his presidency and the Vatican told him that he would be killed in retribution unless he faked his own death and gave up the presidency. JFK agreed to participating a phony assassination—and also to allow a gunman to actually wound him in Dallas. (JFK's wife was also in on the scheme).

Then, on Nov. 22, 1963—or so the story goes—JFK was wounded in Dealey Plaza and then crawled into a secret compartment in the limousine where a dead body (shot in the head) was already in place.

JFK moved the body into place in the back seat of the limousine (with the willing collaboration of his wife, who was there beside him) and then slipped off into exile (allegedly on a Greek island owned by Aristotle Onassis, who later married the Widow Kennedy).

Again, I kid you not.

And then there's the claim by the late Nord Davis that JFK's real assassin was a "Man in Black" (standing not on the famous "grassy knoll" but, instead, across the street) who used a Mauser machine-pistol to fire some 35 bullets—you read that right: 35 bullets or more—into the Kennedy limousine and all over Dealey Plaza, also killing a woman who was one of the spectators.

The Man in Black—so said Davis—was White Russian nobleman George deMohrenschild (the near-legendary friend of accused JFK assassin Lee Harvey Oswald) who was acting on behalf of the Soviet Union (and Vice President Lyndon Johnson) as part of a Communist Plot to put Johnson in the White House.

Now this is all—or should be—obvious nonsense. But, to this day, a lot of people believe this story, because a "good patriot" like Nord Davis said it was true. After all didn't Davis actually read every word of the 26 volumes of the Warren Commission Report?

And didn't Davis have photographic proof that he used that showed, beyond question, that there was indeed a "Man in Black" firing the fatal shots in Dallas?

Never mind the fact that Davis' photographic "proof" happened to be Davis' own hand-drawn adaptations of frames from the famous Zapruder film, not actual frames from the film itself.

The moral to this is that some of the most otherwise discerning truth seekers (for reasons known only to God) continue to cling to some of the most patently stupid stories and often because they originated with someone who has a reputation of being "a good patriot."

But—as we have seen—a lot of those so-called “good patriots” are really disinformation specialists or (at the least) hapless dupes who have been taken in by disinformation specialists. Or just plain fools.

In recent years, it’s been quite disheartening to me—considering my own work on the topic as outlined in *Final Judgment*—that (as a direct consequence of Internet manipulation) many followers of the “alternative” and “patriot” media have more or less reached a “consensus” and decided Lyndon Johnson was the mastermind of the JFK assassination: LBJ launched the conspiracy and covered it up, utilizing renegades in the CIA, the military, the FBI and the Secret Service.

Under no circumstances—so patriots say—was there involvement by Israel’s intelligence service, the Mossad. The fact of numerous intimate Mossad connections (at multiple levels) to the conspiracy—not to mention JFK’s bitter dispute with Israel over its nuclear weapons program—is not considered relevant (or ever even referenced).

As mentioned in Chapter Seven, a forceful proponent of the theme that “LBJ Killed JFK” is Alex Jones who loudly touted a book which actually claims Lee Oswald was, in fact, one of the gunmen who killed JFK!

(And note this: an AFP reader once called Jones’s radio program and mentioned *Final Judgment*, but Jones shouted him down and Jones’s guest, a Jewish writer named Robert Groden, slammed the book as “anti-Semitic” and certainly one to be ignored.)

All told, as you’ll see, the response to *Final Judgment* has been complex and quite interesting, to say the very least.

A top Council on Foreign Relations figure—Christopher LeFleur (then U.S. ambassador to Malaysia)—tried to bribe booksellers in Malaysia not to distribute *Final Judgment* (or my other books) but they wouldn’t be compromised. (God bless them!)

A lot of self-described “white nationalists” rejected *Final Judgment* since they didn’t like JFK’s racial policies (though that had nothing to do with the thesis of the book itself). Others were angry a Black nationalist wrote the introduction to the book.

And some of Israel’s most audacious critics wouldn’t endorse the book because they were afraid of being called “conspiracy theorists.”

A pro-Arab magazine (adamantly hostile to Israel) refused to accept advertising for *Final Judgment* because, the editor said, it might upset “those [expletive deleted] defamation groups,” referring to the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), an arm of the Mossad.

For its part, the ADL orchestrated energetic campaigns to suppress the book and deployed violent thugs from the Jewish Defense League to disrupt my speaking engagements (and threaten my life). And they did much, much more than that—another story for another time.

At one point the ADL actually asserted that college students were not mature enough (!) to hear my thesis, although, of course, the ADL did consider those kids old enough to join the U.S. military and die in wars to assure Israel's survival.

In the meantime, JFK "research" groups denounced me or refused to even mention *Final Judgment*, despite the fact it sold far better than some more widely publicized JFK assassination books.

JFK Lancer's Deb Conway vowed to join pro-Israel groups in picketing one of my lectures. And *Probe's* Jim DiEugenio—who claims a "WASP plot" was behind JFK's death—continues to maliciously misrepresent *Final Judgment* (perhaps because his publishers were funded by a family who bankrolled Israel's nuclear arsenal).

But I did get some good endorsements from historian Eustace Mullins, ex-Pentagon official Col. Donn de Grand Pre, author William Gill, researcher Brian Quig, famed Hollywood screenwriter Bill Norton and a powerful nod from former high-ranking State Department official Herbert L. Calhoun.

But don't forget: "LBJ Killed JFK."

And then, of course, there's all of the nonsense—we explored it earlier in these pages—regarding Oklahoma City and 9-11 which has been crafted to redirect focus attention away from the all of the solid facts which do point toward the role of Israel's Mossad in those acts of terror.

It is acceptable, it seems, at least in some circles, to say that it was the FBI or the BATF or the CIA or Bill Clinton who orchestrated the Oklahoma bombing. Some "patriot" writers have even claimed that "the Muslims" were behind it.

But don't dare mention the Mossad.

And that's the way it also is—and has been—with 9-11.

In 2005, *Popular Mechanics* published a special report, "9-11: Debunking the Myths" that was later expanded into a book, *Debunking 9-11 Myths: Why Conspiracy Theories Can't Stand Up to the Facts*.

However, despite its energetic efforts to delve into many different forensic matters involving 9-11—for example, contrary claims about what did or did not bring down the World Trade Center—*Popular Mechanics* did not publish even a single sentence trying to refute the evidence pointing toward Mossad involvement in 9-11.

And the reason for that is simple: It is impossible to do so.

Popular Mechanics can bring forth a host of "experts" who sound quite authentic and reliable—and undoubtedly many of them are—when they take issue with arguments made about some particular scientific aspect of the 9-11 controversy that is subject to dispute.

However, here's the problem. It's very basic . . .

Popular Mechanics is confronted with the established “fact”—or so it has been described by the 9-11 Commission and by its promoters in the Jewish-controlled media—that the 9-11 mastermind was the infamous Khalid Sheikh Mohammed.

However, the evidence is persuasive that Mohammed was a long-time Mossad asset operating ubiquitously at the highest levels inside Osama bin Laden’s loosely organized network known as Al-Qaeda and that 9-11 was perpetrated (through Mohammed) by Israel’s Mossad.

That, of course, is the quite workable (and reasonable) thesis regarding Israel’s “false flag” template for terror on 9-11 put forth in these pages. And nobody—including *Popular Mechanics*—can refute it.

And yes, needless to say, it all ties back to the JFK assassination and the Oklahoma bombing as well. It all comes full circle.

But the Jewish-controlled Media Monopoly will continue to damn those who say there are conspiracies—particularly involving Israel or Jewish interests in general—and will do all in their power to discredit those who put forth any theories (or just plain facts) that run counter to the New World Order and its intended Jewish global imperium.

What we heard enunciated from Cass Sunstein—in his simple, yet creative (while still destructive) proposal to combat and make fools of serious truth seekers—came to pass when the Crisis Management Conspirators engaged in their clever and evil manipulations after Sandy Hook and Boston. And we can expect more from them in the future.

Mark Glenn—one of the most perceptive commentators in the alternative media today—has likened the consequences of the corrupt Internet manipulations of the Crisis Management Conspirators to an out-of-control, constantly-mutating genetically-engineered virus the human body’s defense mechanisms cannot counter.

With Sandy Hook and Boston the collective immune system of “The Crowd”—the alternative media, real truth seekers—failed. Good People enthusiastically (if unwittingly) invited the Bad People (the creators of that virus) to inject it into the body politic of the truth movement.

As Glenn has pointed out, we are (right now) at the same point where the survivors of a global plague—painted so vividly in Stephen King’s apocalyptic epic novel, *The Stand*—were when forced to finally take a stand and face the Enemy head on.

Acknowledging his book was essentially a Christian allegory, King himself commented that “the important thing is that we are dealing with two elemental forces—White and Black.” And in our own very real world there *are* two elemental forces—White and Black.

The lines are drawn. The time has come. Something *has* to be done.

The moment is upon us. Humanity must take The Stand.

THIS IS MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER . . .

There's no doubt about it—Michael Collins Piper is one of the Israeli lobby's primary targets today . . .

Piper is truly the author they love to hate. Repeatedly attacked by propagandists for Israel, Piper is undaunted, despite the fact his life was threatened by Irv Rubin, violent leader of the terrorist Jewish Defense League. Once, after discovering a wiretap on his telephone, Piper noted wryly, "The Vatican didn't put that wiretap there."

In the style of his combative, colorful great-great grandfather, famed bridge builder "Colonel" John Piper—surrogate father and early business partner of industrial giant Andrew Carnegie—the outspoken author relishes any opportunity to confront his many critics, although they assiduously refuse to debate him.

Like his ancestor, Piper is a bridge builder in his own way. He has lectured around the globe in places as diverse as Abu Dhabi in the United Arab Emirates; Moscow, Russia; Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia; Tokyo, Japan; Tehran, Iran and across Canada. Police-state-minded advocates of war and imperialism are disturbed at Piper's energetic efforts to forge links of understanding among peoples of all creeds and colors.

A lover of dogs, cats and all animals and an unapologetic old-style American progressive in the LaFollette-Wheeler tradition, Piper rejects the labels of "liberal" and "conservative" as being archaic, artificial and divisive, manipulative media buzzwords designed to suppress popular dissent and free inquiry. On one occasion Piper was offered a lucrative assignment in a covert intelligence operation in Africa, but turned it down, preferring his independence—a position in keeping with his ethnic heritage: another of Piper's great-great grandfathers was a full-blooded American Indian.

Sourcing much of his writing from his library of some 10,000 volumes—including many rare works—Piper is a contributor to *American Free Press*, the Washington-based national weekly, and the historical journal, *The Barnes Review*. One media critic hailed Piper as one of the top 25 best writers on the Internet. In 2006 Piper began regular Internet broadcasting. He can be heard at michaelcollinspiper.podbean.com and AmericanFreePress.net. More from Piper can be found at michaelcollinspiper.com.

Throughout his career, Piper has led the way on several major stories. In 1987, he was *the first* to expose the Justice Department frame-up of Pennsylvania State Treasurer Budd Dwyer that led to Dwyer's shocking public suicide. Piper was also *the first* to expose San Francisco-based Roy Bullock as an operative for the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), a conduit for Israel's Mossad, involved in illegal spying on American citizens. This was *seven years* before *The New York Times* confirmed Bullock's ADL link. *The ADL will never forgive Piper for his pivotal front-line role in unmasking Bullock.*

Piper was the *only* journalist to dare to assert the Oklahoma City bombing was a Mossad "false flag" operation aimed at implicating Saddam Hussein—a scheme derailed by U.S. investigators who rejected Israel's machinations, opting instead for another "lone nut" cover-up. Piper's pioneering work on Israel's role in 9-11 has been echoed by truth seekers and damned by defenders of Israel for its accuracy.

